arXiv:1511.01381v2 [math.RT] 23 Dec 2015

ON THE STABILITY AND GELFAND PROPERTY OF SYMMETRIC PAIRS

SHACHAR CARMELI

Abstract. We call a symmetric pair of reductive groups (G, H) **stable** if every closed double coset of H in G is preserved by the corresponding anti-involution.

In the first part of the paper we develop a method to verify the stability property of symmetric pairs over local fields of characteristic 0, using non-abelian group cohomologies.

In the second part we apply our methods to several specific pairs and check their stability. Combining our calculations with results of Aizenbud and Gourevitch, we classify the Gelfand pairs among the pairs $(SL_n(F), (GL_k(F)\times GL_{n-k}(F))\cap SL_n(F))$, $(O(B_1\oplus B_2), O(B_1)\times O(B_2))$, $(U(B_1\oplus B_2), U(B_1)\times U(B_2))$ $(GL_n(F), O(B))$, $(GL_n(F), U(B))$, $(GL_{2n}(F), GL_n(E))$ and $(SL_{2n}(F), SL_n(E))$.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Main Results 2
1.2. Structure of the Paper 3
1.3. Acknowledgments 4
2. Definitions and Notation 4
3. Preliminaries on Group Cohomology 5
3.1. Definition of Group Cohomology 5
3.2. Some properties of $H^1(L, G)$ 6
3.3. Twisting 7
3.4. Galois Cohomology 8
4. Cohomology and Stability 9
4.1. Interpretation of $H^1(\theta, G)$ 9
4.2. Equivalent Condition to Stability 10
4.3. Stable Elements, $H^1(\theta, Z_G(r))$ and $H^1(F, Z_H(r))$ 12
5. Open Orbits in a Parabolic Quotient 13
5.1. Preliminaries on Split Parabolic Subgroups and Split Tori 14
5.2. Different Types of Stability 16
5.3. Verification Methods for Stability 19
6. Calculations 23
6.1. Preliminaries 23
6.2. Some Cohomology Computations 27
6.3. The Pair $(GL(V), GL(V_1(h))\times GL(V_{-1}(h)), Ad_h)$ 29
6.4. The Pair $(SL(V), (GL(V_1(h))\oplus GL(V_{-1}(h)))\cap SL(V), Ad_h)$ 29
6.5. The Pair $(GL(V(E)), GL(V(F)), c)$ 31
6.6. The Pair $(SL(V(E)), SL(V(F)), c)$ 31
6.7. The Pair $(GL_F(V), GL_E(V), Ad_J)$ 33
6.8. The Pair $(SL_F(V), SL_E(V), Ad_J)$ 34
6.9. The Pair $(GL(V), O(B), \theta)$ 35
6.10. The Pair $(GL_E(V), U(B), \theta)$ 36
6.11. The Pair $(O(B), O(B^+)\times O(B^-), Ad_h)$ 36

Date: December 24, 2015.

6.12. The Pair $(U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-), Ad_h)$ 49
6.13. Summary 50
7. Applications to Representation Theory 51
7.1. p-stability and Multiplicity One for Principal Series Representations 51
7.2. Stability and the Gelfand Property 53
References 56

1. Introduction

A pair consisting of a reductive group G and a subgroup H, both defined over a local field F is called a Gelfand pair if the space of H-invariant continuous functionals on every irreducible smooth admissible[1] representation of G is at most one-dimensional. In this paper we consider the case when H is a symmetric subgroup, i.e. the group of fixed points of an involution of G.

It is classically known that if F is Archimedean, G is a connected Lie group and H is compact then (G, H) is a Gelfand pair. If G is not compact then this is usually not the case, as can be seen in particular in this paper. However, many symmetric pairs of reductive non-compact groups were shown to be Gelfand pairs in [vD86, Fli91, BvD94, JR96, AGRS10, AG09, AG10, SZ12, AS12, Aiz13, Zha10]. These papers used the Gelfand-Kazhdan criterion and its extensions. The above criterion reduces the verification of the Gelfand property to a statement on equivariant distributions. In [AG09, AG10] this statement is reduced, for many symmetric pairs, to a geometric statement that in [AG09, AG10] is called "goodness" and we call stability.

We say that a symmetric pair (G, H) is **stable** if every closed double coset $HgH \subset G$ stable under $g \mapsto \theta(g^{-1})$, where θ is the involution of G such that $H = G^\theta$. In this paper we settle the stability problem in a systematic way, producing a practical method to decide the stability for pairs (G, H), given a good enough description of the centralizers of the semi-simple elements in G.

Using this method and the results of [HW93], we link the stability of a pair (G, H) to another geometric property, namely that H has a single open orbit in any parabolic quotient of G. We call this property p-stability, and show that stability implies p-stability. This result, combined with representation-theoretic results due to Blanck - Delorme and van den Ban in their papers [BD08] and [vdB88], shows that both the Gelfand property and the stability property of a pair imply the p-stability, which can be regarded as an evidence to their equivalence. However, for *p-adic* pairs p-stability is strictly weaker than stability, as we give an example of a p-stable pair which is not stable. The equivalence of the stability and p-stability for the real case, as long as for the case in which G is quasi-split is still conjectural.

1.1. Main Results.

Here we shall state the main results proven in this paper. Recall that a symmetric pair (G, H, θ) is called stable if every closed H double-coset in G is stabilized by the anti-involution $g \mapsto \theta(g)^{-1}$.

In section 4 we construct, for each semi-simple $r \in G$ of the form $g\theta(g)^{-1}$, a cohomological obstruction $[r] \in H^1(\theta, G)$. We then prove:

Theorem 1.1.1. *$[r]$ is trivial if and only if HgH is stabilized by the anti-involution $\sigma(g) := \theta(g)^{-1}$.*

Thus, we reduce the varification of the stability of a pair to a cohomology computation.

In section 5 we prove:

Theorem 1.1.2. *If (G, H, θ) is stable then H has a unique open orbit in every parabolic quotient of G.*

[1] If F is Archimedean then admissible means smooth admissible Frechet representation of moderate growth.

The converse is not true in general, as we show in section 5 for the pair (G, H, Ad_i) where G is the group of elements of norm 1 in a non-split quaternion algebra over $\mathbb{Q}_p$ and i is an imaginary quaternion.

We call a symmetric pair (G, H, θ) p-stable if H has a unique open orbit in every parabolic quotient of G. In section 7 we prove:

Theorem 1.1.3. *If the pair (G, H) is a Gelfand pair then the symmetric pair (G, H, θ) is p-stable.*

We also use the results of section 6 regarding stability and the tools developed in [AG09] to verify the Gelfand property for several pairs. In the next results F is either $\mathbb{R}$ or a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$.

Let $S(GL_k(F) \times GL_{n-k}(F))$ be the Levi subgroup of $SL_n(F)$ consisting of block matrices with two blocks of sizes k and $n-k$.

Theorem 1.1.4. *The pair $(SL_n(F), S(GL_k(F) \times GL_{n-k}(F)))$ is a Gelfand pair if and only if $k \neq \frac{n}{2}$.*

Theorem 1.1.5. *Let E/F be a quadratic extension. The pair $(SL_n(E), SL_n(F))$ is a Gelfand pair if and only if n is odd.*

The pairs $(GL_n(E), GL_n(F))$ and $(GL_{n+k}(F), GL_n(F) \times GL_k(F))$ are proven to be Gelfand pairs in [Fli91, JR96, AG09]. For a quadratic extension E/F, embed $GL_n(E)$ (resp. $SL_n(E)$) in $GL_{2n}(F)$ (resp. $SL_{2n}(F)$) via restriction of scalars.

Theorem 1.1.6. *The pair $(GL_{2n}(F), GL_n(E))$ is a Gelfand pair, while $(SL_{2n}(F), SL_n(E))$ is a Gelfand pair if and only if F is Archimedean.*

Let $B = B^+ \oplus B^-$ be a non-degenerate quadratic form represented as a direct sum of two quadratic forms B^+, B^-. The classification of the pairs $(O(B), O(B^+) \times O(B^-))$ is complicated and given in section 7. This classification gives several new small-dimensional examples of Gelfand pairs, such as $(O(B^+ \oplus B^-), O(B^+) \times O(B^-))$ for quadratic forms B^+ and B^- of rank 2 over a non-Archimedean field of odd residual characteristic such that $det(B^+) \neq \pm det(B^-)$. If F is non-Archimedean and $rank(B) \geq 6$ we show that the pair in a Gelfand pair if and only if one of the forms B^+, B^- is of rank at most 1.

In the Archimedean case, we have:

Theorem 1.1.7. *The pair $(O_{p_1+p_2,q_1+q_2}(\mathbb{R}), O_{p_1,q_1}(\mathbb{R}) \times O_{p_2,q_2}(\mathbb{R}))$ is a Gelfand pair if and only if one of the numbers p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 vanishes.*

Similarly, for a Hermitian form $B = B^+ \oplus B^-$ we have:

Theorem 1.1.8. *The pair $(U_{p_1+p_2,q_1+q_2}(\mathbb{R}), U_{p_1,q_1}(\mathbb{R}) \times U_{p_2,q_2}(\mathbb{R}))$ is a Gelfand pair if and only if one of the numbers p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 vanishes.*

If F is non-Archimedean the pair $(U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-))$ is a Gelfand pair if and only if one of the non-degenerate quadratic forms B^+, B^- is of rank 1.

The pairs $(O(B), O(B^+) \times O(B^-))$ and $(U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-))$ with B^+ or B^- of rank 1 over all local fields are proven to be strong Gelfand pairs in [AGRS10, SZ12]. A pair (G, H, θ) is a strong Gelfand pair if $(G \times H, \Delta_H)$ is a Gelfand pair.

All these results depend on stability and p-stability verification, which is summarized in a table in subsection 7.12.

1.2. **Structure of the Paper.** In section 2 we introduce notations, partially standard and partially specific for this article, to be used in the theory of symmetric pairs.

In section 3 we recall the theory of non-abelian group cohomology, which is the main tool we use for our treatment of symmetric pairs.

In section 4 we show how, using only calculation of cohomology groups, one can determine the stability of a symmetric pair.

In section 5 we consider other types of stability, in particular p-stability, and write cohomological invariants for them. We also state and prove several relations between these stability properties.

In section 6 we illustrate the theory by verifying stability for many interesting pairs, some of them are known and some new.

Finally, in section 7 we link the geometric properties we considered to the representation theory of the pair, and conclude by proving the Gelfand property for several pairs.

1.3. **Acknowledgments.** First, I want to deeply thank my advisor Dmitry Gourevitch for teaching me many interesting mathematics, exposing me to the importance of the stability of symmetric pairs and for his help during the entire research process and for being my teacher in the last few years.

I would like to thank also Eugenii Shustin and Joseph Bernstein for teaching me a lot of interesting and important mathematics and for many valuable discussions.

I want to thank also some other people for their valuable comments and references which pushed the research forward at many critical points. Among them are Aloysius G. Helminck, Avraham Aizenbud, Gal Dor, Michael Borovoi and many others.

I would like to thank also Lev Radzivilovsky for his help in organizing the paper, for fixing some mistakes he found in it, and for his major part in my mathematical education.

Finally, I want to thank my parents, family and friends for their support and inspiration.

2. Definitions and Notation

We shall use the following standard notation in this paper:

- For a group G and a subset $X \subseteq G$ we let $Z_G(X) = \{g \in G| : gx = xg \quad \forall x \in X\}$ be the centralizer of X.
- If G acts on X and $x \in X$, we let $Stb_G(x) = \{g \in G| : g(x) = x\}$.
- F is a local field of characteristic 0.
- $\bar{F}$ is the algebraic closure of F.
- $\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{G}$, e.t.c. will denote reductive algebraic groups defined over F (which will always be clear from the context).
- Γ_F will be the absolute Galois group of F.
- For a torus $\mathbf{A}$ we let $X^*(\mathbf{A}) = Hom(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{G}_m)$ be the group of characters and $X_*(\mathbf{A}) = Hom(\mathbf{G}_m, \mathbf{A})$ the group of one-parameter subgroups.
- For a character $\psi : \mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{G}_m$ and a one-parameter subgroup $\alpha : \mathbf{G}_m \to \mathbf{A}$, let $< \psi, \alpha >$ be the unique integer such that $t^{<\psi,\alpha>} = \psi(\alpha(t))$. If $\mathbf{A}$ is defined over F, this pairing turn $X^*(\mathbf{A})$ and $X_*(\mathbf{A})$ into dual Γ_F-modules.
- For a linear algebraic group $\mathbf{P}$ and a torus $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{P}$, let $\Phi(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{P}) \subseteq X^*(\mathbf{A})$ be the set of roots of $\mathbf{A}$ in $\mathbf{P}$.
- If $\Phi \subseteq V$ is a symmetric finite set of vectors in a real linear space then by a **collection of positive roots** in Φ we mean an intersection of Φ with an half-space containing no element of Φ. This is compatible with the notion of positive roots from the theory of root systems.

Let $G = \mathbf{G}(F)$ be a reductive algebraic group over a local field F, and let θ be an involution of G defined over F. We consider G and all its subspaces and quotients with their usual topology arising from the topology of F, sometimes called **the t-topology**. Call (G, H, θ) a **symmetric pair**, where $H = G^\theta$ is the group of fixed points θ. We will always assume that $\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{H}$ is connected in the Zariski topology. We shall follow the following notation: for an algebraic group $\mathbf{G}$ defined over F, the group G will be the F-rational points of $\mathbf{G}$, where the local field F will always be assumed fixed. For an extension K/F, we will denote the K-rational points of $\mathbf{G}$ by the standard notation $\mathbf{G}(K)$.

The following notions will be frequently used:

- $\sigma(g) = \theta(g^{-1})$
- $H = G^\theta = \{g \in G| : \theta(g) = g\}$ will be referred to as the **orthogonal part** of G.
- $S = G^\sigma$ will be referred to as the **symmetric part** of G.

- $s(g) = g\sigma(g)$ will be called **symmetrization**.
- $\bar{s}(g) = \sigma(g)g$ will be called **anti-symmetrization**.

The notion extend the analogy with the example $(GL_n(\mathbb{R}), O_n(\mathbb{R}), (g \mapsto (g^t)^{-1}))$, which will be discussed soon.

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the Lie algebra of G. The differential $d\theta$ acts on $\mathfrak{g}$ as an involution. Since the minimal polynomial of linear operator $d\theta$ is $p(x) = x^2 - 1 = (x-1)(x+1)$, the linear space $\mathfrak{g}$ is naturally decomposed into a direct sum $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{s}$, where $\mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{s}$ are respectively the $+1$ and -1 eigen-spaces of $d\theta$. The spaces $\mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{s}$ can be seen also as the tangent spaces of H and S. Since H is a Lie subgroup, $\mathfrak{h}$ is a Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. We are interested in deciding which symmetric pairs are **stable**, in the following sense.

Definition 2.0.1. *A symmetric pair (G, θ) is called **stable** if every closed double coset of H in G is stable under σ. In other words, for each $g \in G$ such that HgH is closed in G,*

$$\sigma(HgH) = HgH.$$

Remark 2.0.1. *This notion is referred to as a **good** pair in* [AG09]. *We chose the word stable to indicate that the notion is related to the stability of the double cosets.*

Similarly, an element $g \in G$ will be called stable if HgH is stable under σ. So, the pair (G, H, θ) is stable if and only if every $g \in G$ with closed $H \times H$-orbit is stable.

Several examples of symmetric pairs:

Example 2.0.1. *Let $G = \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$, $\theta(g) = (g^{-1})^t$.*

In this case $\sigma(g) = g^t$, $H = O_n(\mathbb{R})$, S is the set of symmetric matrices, $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{so}_n$, and $\mathfrak{s}$ is the set of symmetric matrices in $\mathfrak{gl}_n$. The symmetrization map is given by $s(g) = gg^t$ and its opposite is given by $\bar{s}(g) = gg^t$.

Example 2.0.2. *Let $\boldsymbol{G}$ be a reductive group and let K/F be a quadratic extension. Let c denote the unique non-trivial element of $Gal_{K/F}$. Then $(\boldsymbol{G}(K), G, c)$, when considered as a pair over F (we consider $\boldsymbol{G}(K)$ as an F-group!), is a symmetric pair.*

Recall that the adjoint group of G is defined as $Ad_G := G/Z(G)$ and for each $x \in G$ the corresponding $Ad_x \in Ad_G$ acts by conjugation on G, as well as on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$.

Example 2.0.3. *Let G be a reductive group defined over F and let $h \in G$ be an element of order 2. Then $(G, Z_G(h), Ad_h)$ is a symmetric pair. The example works also if Ad_h is of order 2 in Ad_G.*

Example 2.0.4. *Let G be a reductive group, and let $\Delta(G) = \{(g, g) | : g \in G\} \subseteq G$ be the diagonal subgroup of $G \times G$. Then $(G \times G, \Delta(G), (x, y) \mapsto (y, x))$ is a symmetric pair.*

Example 2.0.5. *Let G be a reductive Lie group and θ a Cartan involution of G. Then H is a maximal compact subgroup, and (G, H, θ) is called a **Riemannian symmetric pair**.*

3. Preliminaries on Group Cohomology

The language of non-abelian first group cohomology is extremely useful in order to verify whether a given pair is stable or not. In this section we briefly remind some basic points of the theory, which are essential for our approach. We skip the proofs and the details. A complete treatment of the subject can be found in [Ser97, §5].

3.1. **Definition of Group Cohomology.** Let G be an abstract group, and let L be a group acting on G by automorphisms. That is, for every $l \in L$ we have an automorphism of G denoted by $g \mapsto l(g)$, such that:

- If $e_L \in L$ is the identity of L, then for every $g \in G$, $e_L(g) = g$.
- for all $l, t \in L$ and all $g \in G$, $lt(g) = l(t(g))$.

A group G together with an L-action is called an **L-group**. To every L-group G we can consider G^L, the group of L-fixed points in G. The first cohomology of L with coefficients in G is a measure for the lack of right-exactness of the fixed-points functor. It is a pointed set denoted $H^1(L,G)$.

Definition 3.1.1. *Let G be an L-group. An **1-cocycle** of L with coefficients in G is a function $\theta \mapsto a_\theta$ from L to G, such that*

$$a_{\theta\tau} = a_\theta \cdot \theta(a_\tau).$$

The set of all 1-cocycles of L with coefficients in G is denoted $Z^1(L,G)$.

The formula $a_{\theta\tau} = a_\theta \cdot \theta(a_\tau)$ is called the **cocycle condition**. The group G acts on $Z^1(L,G)$ from the right via

$$(\delta_g(a))_l := g^{-1}a_l l(g).$$

We call this action the **coboundary action**. Two cocycles in the same G-orbit are called **cohomologous**. In $Z^1(L,G)$ there is a distinguished point, namely the cocycle for which $a_\theta = e_G$ for all $\theta \in L$. We refer to this cocycle as the **trivial cocycle**. Every element in the G-orbit of the distinguished cocycle is called a **coboundary**. The set of coboundaries is denoted by $B^1(L,G)$.

Definition 3.1.2. *Let G be an L-group. The first cohomology of L with coefficients in G is the set of orbits $H^1(L,G) = Z^1(L,G)/\delta_G$.*

An L-equivariant homomorphism of L-groups $f : K \to G$ induces a map of pointed sets $f_* : H^1(L,K) \to H^1(L,G)$ given by

$$f_*(a)_\theta := f(a_\theta).$$

If $K \subseteq G$ we let i_K^G denote the inclusion.

Definition 3.1.3. *Let $K \subseteq G$ be an L-subgroup of an L group G. We will denote*

$$KH^1(L,K,G) := Ker((i_K^G)_*),$$
$$IH^1(L,K,G) := Im((i_K^G)_*).$$

Recall that the kernel of a map $f : (X,x_0) \to (Y,y_0)$ of pointed sets is by definition $f^{-1}(y_0)$.

First cohomologies are not groups, but they still have the structure of pointed sets. The base-point of $H^1(L,G)$ is the equivalence class of the trivial cocycle $a_\theta \equiv e_G$.

3.2. **Some properties of $H^1(L,G)$.** The following facts will be useful in our treatment of the stability question.

Theorem 3.2.1. *Let*

$$1 \longrightarrow H \longrightarrow G \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow 1$$

be an exact sequence of L-groups. There is a coboundary map

$$\delta : K^L \to H^1(L,H)$$

such that the sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow H^L \longrightarrow G^L \longrightarrow K^L \xrightarrow{\delta} H^1(L,H) \longrightarrow H^1(L,G) \longrightarrow H^1(L,K)$$

is an exact sequence of pointed sets.

For $k \in K^L$, $\delta(k)$ is computed as follows:

- Find $g \in G$ such that g maps to k under the map $G \to K$.
- Compute the coboundary $b_\sigma = \delta_g(e)_\sigma = g^{-1}\sigma(g) \in B^1(L,G)$.
- $\delta(k)$ is defined as a pre-image $a_\sigma \in Z^1(L,H)$ of b_σ.

That is, we chase k along the following path:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \delta(k) \in Z^1(L,H) & \longrightarrow & \delta_g(e)_\sigma \in B^1(L,G) \\ & & \uparrow \\ g \in G & \longrightarrow & k \in K^L \end{array}$$

This is not hard to see that δ is well defined and that the long sequence above is actually an exact sequence.

Exactness for sequences of pointed sets is weaker than the corresponding property for sequences of groups. The statement of Theorem 3.2.1 can be strengthened in two ways. Firstly, one can replace the group K in the sequence with an L-set on which G acts transitively. Secondly, for an injection $f : H \to G$ of L-groups one can describe all the fibers of the map $f_* : H^1(L,K) \to H^1(L,G)$, and not only the pre-image of the trivial cocycle. The description of the fibers is given by the twisting operation, to be described in the next subsection.

Let G be an L-group acting transitively on an L-set X having a base point $x_0 \in X$ which is stabilized by L. Let K be the stabilizer of x_0 in G. Then we can define as in Theorem 3.2.1 a coboundary operator $\delta : X^L \to H^1(L,K)$. The definition is similar. Given $x \in X^L$, as G acts transitively on X, we can find $g \in G$ such that $x = g(x_0)$. By the L-invariance of both x and x_0, we get $x = g(x_0) = l(g)(x_0)$ for every $l \in L$. Therefore, $\delta_g(e)_l = g^{-1}l(g) \in K$. We define $\delta(x)$ to be the cocycle $l \to \delta_g(e)_l = g^{-1}l(g)$.

Theorem 3.2.2. *Let G be an L-group acting transitively on an L-set X possessing an L-fixed point x_0. Let $K = Stb_G(x_0)$. Then δ defines a bijection*

$$X^L/G^L \cong KH^1(L,K,G).$$

For the proof see e.g. [Ber10].

3.3. **Twisting.** An important feature of non-abelian group cohomology is the twisting operation. Let G be an L-group acting on an L-set X. Let a be a 1-cocycle of L with coefficients in G. Then, using a, it is possible to twist the action of L on X, as well as on G, to obtain a new pair (G,X) of an L-group acting on an L-set. It is done in the following way. Define a new action of L on X, denoted $x \mapsto l * x$, by

$$l * (x) := a_l(l(x)).$$

Similarly, define a new action of L on G by

$$l * (g) := a_l \cdot l(g) \cdot a_l^{-1}.$$

The pair (G,X) with the new actions is the twisting of X and G by a. In order to distinguish it from the original pair, we denote it by $(\tau_a(G), \tau_a(X))$. Some routine verifications have to be performed, for example:

$$\begin{aligned} &lt * (x) = a_{lt}(lt(x)) = && \text{(by the cocycle condition)} \\ &= a_l l(a_t)(l(t(x)) = a_l l(a_t(t(x))) = l * (a_t t(x)) = l * (t * (x)) \end{aligned}$$

which shows that the twisted action is associative, and

$$\begin{aligned} l * (g(x)) &= a_l l(g(x)) = a_l l(g)(l(x)) = a_l l(g)(a_l^{-1}a_l)(l(x)) = \\ &= (a_l l(g) a_l^{-1})(a_l(l(x))) = (l * g)(l * x) \end{aligned}$$

which shows that the actions are compatible.

The twisting operation is important for two reasons. Firstly, it allows one to compute cohomologies of a twisted pair by mean of the cohomology of the original pair. Secondly, using twisting we can describe completely the fibers of $(i_K^G)_*$ for $K \subseteq G$.

Since from now on the δ operation can be defined using G as well as $\tau_a(G)$, we will indicate which δ we use by writing the group G on top of it: $\delta = \delta^G$.

Theorem 3.3.1. *Let G be an L-group, and let $a \in Z^1(L,G)$. Then there is a natural bijection $\tau_a : H^1(L,\tau_a G) \xrightarrow{\approx} H^1(L,G)$ given by $\tau_a(b)_l = b_l a_l$.*

Proof. We shall show that the map is well defined, as it is clearly bijective if it is well defined, its inverse being the twisting by a_l^{-1} of $\tau_a(G)$. Let b be a cocycle of $\tau_a(G)$. We have to check the cocycle condition for $b_l a_l$ as a cocycle for G. By the cocycle condition in $\tau_a(G)$, we have $b_{lt} = b_l l * (b_t)$. Substitute the definition of $l * ()$ into this formula, we find that $b_{lt} = b_l \cdot a_l \cdot l(b_t) \cdot a_l^{-1}$. Multiply both sides by $a_{lt} = a_l l(a_t)$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} b_{lt} \cdot a_{lt} = b_l \cdot (a_l \cdot l(b_t) \cdot a_l^{-1}) \cdot a_{lt} = b_l \cdot a_l \cdot l(b_t) \cdot a_l^{-1} \cdot a_l \cdot l(a_t) = \\ = b_l \cdot a_l \cdot l(b_t) \cdot l(a_t) = b_l \cdot a_l \cdot l(b_t \cdot a_t) \end{aligned}$$

This is just the cocycle condition for $b_l a_l$ in G. So the map sends cocycles to cocycles. It is not harder to show that the map is equivariant with respect to the δ actions in $\tau_a(G)$ and G. By definition $\delta_g^{\tau_a(G)}(b)_l = g^{-1} \cdot b_l \cdot l * (g) = g^{-1} \cdot (b_l \cdot a_l \cdot l(g) \cdot a_l^{-1}) = \delta_g^G(ba)_l \cdot a_l^{-1}$. Multiplying by a_l from the right both sides of this equation, we get $\delta_g^{\tau_a(G)}(b)_l \cdot a_l = \delta_g^G(ba)_l$. ∎

This theorem is useful because it allows us to use any twist of G in order to compute its cohomology.

3.4. **Galois Cohomology.** Suppose that L is the Galois group of a separable extension K/F, and that $\mathbf{G}$ is an algebraic group defined over F. Then $H^1(L/F, G(L))$ is called the **Galois cohomology** of the extension K/F with coefficients in G, and denoted $H^1(K/F,G)$. If $K = F^{sep}$ is the separable closure of F, we even write it as $H^1(F,G)$. The following computation is basic for many other computations of cohomologies. Note that in general Galois cohomology is defined as the continuous cohomology group, but we consider only finite extensions here anyway, so this issue is irrelevant for us.

Theorem 3.4.1. *(Hilbert's 90 Theorem)*
Let L/K be a Galois extension. Then

$$H^1(L/K, GL_n(L)) = 1.$$

Remark 3.4.1. *This formulation of Hilbert's 90 Theorem is not the original formulation. Originally, the statement of this theorem is that elements of norm 1 in a cyclic Galois extension L of F are all of the form $\frac{c(x)}{x}$ for c a generator of $\Gamma_{L/F}$. However, this is the form in which the theorem is most useful for us, and in fact Theorem 3.4.1 is a generalization of the original statement.*

The following consequence of Hilbert's 90 Theorem is useful for us as well.

Theorem 3.4.2. *Let L/F be a separable extension, and let $A \in M_{n\times n}(F)$. Then*

$$H^1(F, Z_{\mathrm{GL}_n}(A)) = 1.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{X}$ denote the conjugacy class of A in $M_{n\times n}(L)$. Then Theorem 3.2.2 shows that

$$KH^1(L/F, Z_{GL_n}(A), GL_n) \cong \mathbf{X}(F)/GL_n(F)$$

where $GL_n(F)$ acts on $\mathbf{X}(F)$ by conjugation.

By Hilbert's 90 Theorem,

$$H^1(L/F, GL_n) = 1$$

and therefore

$$H^1(L/F, Z_{GL_n}(A)) \cong \mathbf{X}(F)/GL_n(F).$$

But it is a classical theorem in linear algebra that if two F-matrices are conjugate over L, they are also conjugate over F. We deduce that $GL_n(F)$ acts transitively on $\mathbf{X}(F)$. ∎

4. Cohomology and Stability

Given a symmetric pair (G, H, θ), we would like to describe an efficient method, that after finitely many steps will allow us to decide whether or not (G, H, θ) is stable. In this section we describe such a method, and prove that it actually gives the correct answer.

Definition 4.0.1. *Let G be a topological group acting continuously on a topological space X. An element $x \in X$ is called G-semi-simple if the orbit $Gx \subset X$ is closed.*

When a reductive group G over an algebraically closed field acts on itself by conjugation, this definition is consistent with the usual definition of semi-simplicity.

We restate the condition of stability using this definition: the pair (G, H, θ) is stable if and only if every $H \times H$-semi-simple element of G is stable.

4.1. **Interpretation of $H^1(\theta, G)$.** We would like to give an explicit description of the cohomology set $H^1(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}, G)$ with $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ acting by $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} = \{Id_G, \theta\}$. This treatment of involutions using cohomology can be found in [BJ05, §II.5]. In this case, we shall denote the cohomology by $H^1(\theta, G)$. Let a_θ be a cocycle. There are 4 cocycle conditions on a:

$$a_{Id} = a_{Id^2} = a_{Id} \cdot Id(a_{Id}) = a_{Id} \cdot a_{Id} \tag{1}$$

$$a_\theta = a_{Id\cdot\theta} = a_{Id} \cdot Id(a_\theta) = a_{Id} \cdot a_\theta \tag{2}$$

$$a_\theta = a_{\theta\cdot Id} = a_\theta \cdot \theta(a_{Id}) \tag{3}$$

$$a_{Id} = a_{\theta\cdot\theta} = a_\theta \cdot \theta(a_\theta) \tag{4}$$

Condition (1) is equivalent to $a_{Id} = e_G$. Substituting this into (2) and (3) we see that they are consequences of (1). Finally, condition (4) is equivalent to $a_\theta \in S$. Next, we describe the coboundary action on these cocycles. This is given by

$$\delta_g(a)_{Id} = g^{-1} \cdot a_{Id} \cdot g = g^{-1} \cdot g = e_G$$

$$\delta_g(a)_\theta = g^{-1} \cdot a_\theta \cdot \theta(g)$$

We deduce the following:

Lemma 4.1.1. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair. Let G act on S by $\delta_g(r) = g^{-1} \cdot r \cdot \theta(g)$. Then there is a natural bijection $H^1(\theta, G) \equiv S/\delta_G$, given by $a \mapsto a_\theta$.*

Corollary 4.1.2. *Let $r \in S$. Then r is a symmetrization of an element in G if and only if the corresponding cohomology class $[r] \in H^1(\theta, G)$ is trivial.*

According to Lemma 4.1.1, $H^1(\theta, G)$ has a natural topology, coming from the topology of S as a closed subvariety of G. We shall prove that the induced topology on $H^1(\theta, G)$ is discrete. Equivalently, the G-orbits in S are all open. This is a well known result, and will play a central role in our approach to stability. In order to prove this, we use the open mapping theorem for the action.

Definition 4.1.1. *Let G be an analytic F-group acting on an analytic manifold X. Then G acts **submersively** if for every $x \in X$, the action map*

$$\phi_x : G \to X$$

given by $\phi_x(g) := g(x)$ is submersive. Equivalently, the action is submersive if the global vector fields on X induced by $\mathfrak{g}$ span the tangent space of X at every point.

Remark 4.1.1. *It is clear that for a transitive action, submersivity in one point is equivalent to submersivity.*

Since submersions are always open, if G acts submersively on X then every orbit of G in X is open. Therefore, in order to prove that $H^1(\theta, G)$ is discrete, it will be sufficient to prove that G act submersively on $Z^1(\theta, G) \cong S$. This is what we shall prove now.

Theorem 4.1.3. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair. Then the action of G on S given by δ is submersive.*

Proof. We have to prove that, at any point $r \in S$, the action map $\phi_r(g) = g^{-1}r\theta(g)$ is submersive. Consider first the special case $r = e_G$. At this point, we get

$$\phi_{e_G}(g) = s(g^{-1}).$$

We have a direct decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{s}$. The map ds is given by

$$ds(X + Y) = 2Y,$$

where $X \in \mathfrak{h}, Y \in \mathfrak{s}$. This map is clearly onto $T_{e_G}S \cong \mathfrak{s}$. This, together with Remark 4.1.1 shows that the δ action is submersive at every point of S_0. For a point $r \in S - S_0$, we use twisting. Let $r \in S$, and let $G' = \tau_r(G)$. We add $'$ to things related to G', so that S' will be cocycles of the twisted action and ϕ' the action map of the twisted action. Let $Id : G' \to G$ be the identity map sending each element to itself. Consider the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S' & \xrightarrow{\cdot r} & S \\ {\scriptstyle \phi'_e}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \phi_r} \\ G' & \xrightarrow{Id} & G \end{array}$$

This square is commutative (it was shown in Theorem 3.3.1). As the two horizontal maps are isomorphisms, the submersivity of ϕ_r follows from that of ϕ'_e which is the special case $r = e$ for G'. ∎

Corollary 4.1.4. *The orbits of G in $S(G) = Z^1(\theta, G)$ are open.*

Corollary 4.1.5. *$H^1(\theta, G)$ is discrete for every symmetric pair (G, H, θ).*

Remark 4.1.2. *It is worth mentioning that in the proof of Theorem 4.1.3 we used the case $r = e$ for all the twistings of G at the same time, and we could not deduce this using only the special case $r = e$ for G itself. It is therefore **not** a direct consequence of the equivariance of the action map.*

4.2. **Equivalent Condition to Stability.** Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair. We would like to describe stable elements of G in terms of the conjugacy classes of their symmetrizations. This is done as follows. Let $s : G \to S$ be the symmetrization map. Let S_0 be its image in S. As in §4.1, the map s is submersive everywhere, hence open. We can view it as the action map of the transitive left action of G on S_0 given by $g \mapsto \delta_{g^{-1}}$. The map s is invariant to multiplication from the right by H, as if $\theta(h) = h$, then $s(gh) = ghh^{-1}\sigma(g) = s(g)$. Therefore, s induces a submersive G-equivariant map $s : G/H \to S_0$.

Lemma 4.2.1. *The symmetrization map defines an isomorphism of analytic manifolds*

$$s : G/H \longrightarrow S_0.$$

Proof. As S_0 is a homogenous space for G, it is sufficient to prove that H is the stabilizer of e in S. But

$$s(g) = e \Leftrightarrow g\sigma(g) = e \Leftrightarrow g = \theta(g) \Leftrightarrow g \in H$$

∎

The H action on G/H by multiplication from the left, transformed by s to conjugation. It follows from Lemma 4.2.1 that $H\backslash G/H \cong S_0/Ad_H$. The action of σ on the double-cosets space pass by s to the action $Ad_H(s(g)) \to Ad_H(\bar{s}(g))$, where $\bar{s}(g) = \sigma(g)g$. The next proposition follows:

Proposition 4.2.2. *An element $g \in G$ is stable if and only if $s(g)$ and $\bar{s}(g)$ are conjugate to each other by an element of H.*

This proposition means that we can check the stability of an element by looking at the H-conjugacy class of its symmetrization. Note that in particular, the stability of g depends only on the H-conjugacy class of $s(g)$.

As the map s is a homeomorphism from G/H to S_0, g is $H \times H$ semi-simple if and only if $s(g)$ is Ad_H semi-simple. In [AG09, Theorem 7.2.1], it was proved that the Ad_H semi-simplicity of $r \in S$ implies its Ad_G semi-simplicity. We complete the scheme by proving that if $r \in S$ is Ad_G semi-simple, it is also Ad_H semi-simple. Let $r \in S$ be Ad_G semi-simple. Then the orbit $Ad_G(r)$ is closed in G. Clearly $Ad_H(r) \subset Ad_G(r) \cap S$. The set $Ad_G(r) \cap S$ is closed in G. Thus, it will be sufficient to prove that $Ad_H(r)$ is closed in $Ad_G(r) \cap S$. We shall actually prove a stronger result.

Lemma 4.2.3. *The orbits of Ad_H in $Ad_G(r) \cap S$ are open and closed. In other words, the quotient $(Ad_G(r) \cap S)/Ad_H$ is discrete.*

Proof. We define a continuous injection

$$(Ad_G(r) \cap S)/Ad_H \hookrightarrow H^1(\theta, Z_G(r)).$$

Let $g \in G$, and assume that $grg^{-1} \in S$. Then $\theta(g)\theta(r)\theta(g)^{-1} = gr^{-1}g^{-1}$. On the other hand,

$$\theta(g)\theta(r)\theta(g)^{-1} = \theta(g)r^{-1}\theta(g)^{-1}.$$

Inverting the identity above, we get that

$$grg^{-1} = \theta(g)r\theta(g^{-1}).$$

Therefore, the coboundary $s(g^{-1}) = g^{-1}\theta(g)$ belongs to $Z_G(r)$. It is clear that changing the choice of g change the cocycle to an equivalent one in $Z^1(\theta, G)$. Indeed, if $grg^{-1} = g'rg'^{-1}$, then $g'^{-1}g \in Z_G(r)$. So

$$s(g^{-1}) = s((gg'^{-1}g')^{-1}) = \delta(g'^{-1}g)(s(g^{-1}))$$

which is equivalent to $s(g^{-1})$ as a cocycle of $Z_G(r)$. The injectivity is also not hard to check. If $s(g^{-1}) = s(g'^{-1})$, the elements g and g' differ by a multiplication **from the left** by an element of H, by Lemma 4.2.1. Write $g = hg'$ for $h \in H$, we get that $grg^{-1} = h(g'rg'^{-1})h^{-1}$. This does not change the Ad_H-orbit, so the map is injective. ∎

Lemma 4.2.3 does not follow directly from Theorem 3.2.2, as we take anti-fixed points instead of fixed points. But the proofs of the two are identical. In particular, the morphism we constructed in the proof is actually an isomorphism of topological spaces

$$(Ad_G(r) \cap S)/Ad_H \cong KH^1(\theta, Z_G(r), G)$$

As the cohomology $H^1(\theta, Z_G(r))$ is discrete, we deduce that $(Ad_G(r) \cap S)/Ad_H$ is also discrete, so the Ad_H orbits in $Ad_G(r) \cap S$ are open and closed. We proved therefore that Ad_G semi-simplicity implies Ad_H semi-simplicity for elements in S. Combining all the results above, we deduce the following:

Theorem 4.2.4. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair, and let $g \in G$. The following three are equivalent:*

1. *g is $H \times H$ semi-simple.*
2. *$s(g)$ is Ad_H semi-simple.*
3. *$s(g)$ is Ad_G semi-simple.*

Proof. (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2) is a consequence of Lemma 4.1.1. The implication (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) is already proved in [AG09, Proposition 7.2.1], and (3) $\Rightarrow$ (2) is a consequence of Lemma 4.2.3. ∎

We conclude with an application to the stability of Riemannian pairs, a fact which is simple and well known.

Theorem 4.2.5. *Let (G, H, θ) be a Riemannian symmetric pair. Then (G, H, θ) is stable.*

Proof. It will be sufficient to prove that $s(g) \cong \bar{s}(g)$ for every g for which $s(g)$ is semi-simple. But $S_0 = s(G)$ is a Riemannian symmetric space and hence a complete Riemannian manifold. It follows that $exp : \mathfrak{s} \to S_0$ is onto so $s(g) = exp(X) = [exp(X/2)]^2$ for some $X \in S_0$. So $s(g) = s(exp(X/2))$ and therefore $Ad_H(bars(g)) = Ad_H(exp(X)) = Ad_H(s(g))$. ■

4.3. **Stable Elements, $H^1(\theta, Z_G(r))$ and $H^1(F, Z_H(r))$.** In the last section we reduced the problem of the stability of $g \in G$ to the problem of the H-conjugacy of $s(g)$ and $\bar{s}(g)$. In this section we construct cohomological obstructions for the conjugacy of $s(g)$ and $\bar{s}(g)$ under H.

Definition 4.3.1. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair, and r a semi-simple element of S. The pair $(Z_G(r), Z_H(r), \theta)$ is a **descendant** of the pair (G, H, θ).*

The understanding of the descendants of a pair is an essential part in checking its stability.

4.3.1. *First Invariant, $H^1(F, Z_H(r))$.* The first invariant of an element $r \in S_0(G)$ lives in the cohomology $H^1(F, Z_H(r))$ and it vanishes exactly when r and $\bar{r}$ are H-conjugate, where $\bar{r}$ denotes $\bar{s}(g)$ for some $g \in G$ with $s(g) = r$. In practice, we find the second invariant much more suitable for computation. We added the construction of the first invariant for theoretical completeness and because it is a direct generalization of the original method used by Aizenbud and Gourevitch to prove stability of certain pairs.

For the construction of the first invariant, we need the notion of a sub-pair.

Definition 4.3.2. *A symmetric pair (G, H, θ) is a **sub-pair** of the pair (G', H', θ') if $G \subseteq G'$ and $\theta'|_G = \theta$. If there is a group L acting on G in a way compatible with the action of θ, and such that $G = G'^L$, we say that (G, H, θ) is the **fixed pair** of L.*

Suppose that the symmetric pair (G, H, θ) can be embedded in a larger stable pair (G', H', θ') as the fixed pair of some group L. As we have two pairs to deal with, we will add $'$ to everything related to G'. For example, the symmetric part of G' will be denoted by S', and so on. Let $g \in G$, we would like to check if $s(g) = r \in S_0$ and $\bar{s}(g) = \bar{r}$ are H-conjugate. As the pair (G', H', θ) is stable, $\bar{s}(g) \in Ad_{H'}(s(g))$. We are now in a situation similar to the situation of Theorem 3.2.2. Namely, let $X' = Ad_{H'}(s(g))$. As H' acts transitively on X' which has an L-fixed point with stabilizer $Z_{H'}(s(g))$, according to Theorem 3.2.2 we find that

$$(X'^L)/Ad_H \cong KH^1(L, Z_{H'}(r), G').$$

This isomorphism allows us to associate with $\bar{r}$ a cohomology class in $H^1(L, Z_{H'}(r))$, which we denote by $[\bar{r}]$. Apparently, $[\bar{r}]$ depends on the choice of g. But by Lemma 4.2.1, two different choices of g differ by an element of H, so changing the choice of g has no effect on the cohomology class. The injectivity of the association $r \mapsto [\bar{r}]$ implies the following:

Proposition 4.3.1. *Let (G', H', θ') be a stable symmetric pair, and let (G, H, θ) be a sub-pair of (G', H', θ') which is the fixed pair of the group L. An element $r \in S_0$ is stable, in the sense that $\bar{r} \in Ad_H(r)$, if and only if $[\bar{r}] = 0$ in $H^1(L, Z_{H'}(r))$.*

There is a general way to embed a given pair in a stable one. One can just take the base-change to the algebraic closure. It is true in general that if $\mathbf{G}(\bar{F})/\mathbf{H}(\bar{F})$ is connected, the pair $(\mathbf{G}(\bar{F}), \mathbf{H}(\bar{F}), \theta)$ is stable. For a proof, see e.g. [AG09, Corollary 7.1.7]. As a consequence, we get:

Proposition 4.3.2. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair, and assume that $\boldsymbol{G}(\bar{F})/\boldsymbol{H}(\bar{F})$ is connected. Then for every $r \in S_0$ there is a well defined cohomology class $[\bar{r}] \in H^1(F, Z_H(r))$ that vanishes if and only if r is conjugate by H to $\bar{r}$.*

4.3.2. *Second Invariant,* $H^1(\theta, Z_G(r))$. There is an intrinsic invariant of semi-simple elements in S_0, which is far more useful in our treatment of stability. Let $r \in S_0$, and choose $g \in G$ such that $r = s(g)$. Then, by definition,

$$g^{-1}rg = g^{-1}s(g)g = \bar{s}(g) = \bar{r}.$$

This identity together with Theorem 3.2.2 suggests that we should look at the cohomology class of $r = s(g) = \delta_{g^{-1}}(e)$ as a cohomology class in $KH^1(\theta, Z_G(r), G)$. We claim that this is indeed an obstruction for stability. This is a good place to recall what a normal element is.

Definition 4.3.3. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair, and let $g \in G$. Call g **normal** if and only if g commutes with $\theta(g)$.*

Proposition 4.3.3. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair, and let $s(g) = r \in S_0$. Then g is stable if and only if r is a symmetrization of an element in $Z_G(r)$.*

Proof. Assume that $r = s(g)$ is stable. Then there is $h \in H$ such that $hrh^{-1} = \bar{r}$. It follows that $ghr(gh)^{-1} = g\bar{r}g^{-1} = r$ so $r = s(g) = s(gh)$ and $gh \in Z_G(r)$. This shows that r is a symmetrization of an element in $Z_G(r)$.

Conversely, assume that r is a symmetrization of $g = Z_G(r)$. Then $\bar{r} = g^{-1}s(g)g = r$, so r is stable. ■

Using cohomological notation, we can reformulate this result as follows:

Proposition 4.3.4. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair, and let $s(g) = r \in S_0$. Let $[r]$ be the corresponding cohomology class in $KH^1(\theta, Z_G(r), G)$. Then g is stable if and only if $[r]$ is trivial in $H^1(\theta, Z_G(r))$.*

Using a small modification of the result above, we can give a cohomological criterion which has no reference to symmetric elements but only to subgroups of G. However, this will be only necessary and not sufficient condition. In order to do this, we need a definition:

Definition 4.3.4. *A torus $\boldsymbol{A} \subseteq \boldsymbol{G}$ is called θ-**split** if and only if $\theta(x) = x^{-1}$ for every $x \in \boldsymbol{A}$.*

As usual, if $\mathbf{A}$ is defined over F we denote its F-points by A, and refer to A as a θ-split F-torus.

Theorem 4.3.5. *If a symmetric pair (G, H, θ) is stable and A is a maximal θ-split F-torus of G, then*

$$IH^1(\theta, A, Z_G(A)) \cap KH^1(\theta, Z_G(A), G) = 1.$$

Proof. Assume that (G, H, θ) is stable, and let

$$\alpha \in IH^1(\theta, A, Z_G(A)) \cap KH^1(\theta, Z_G(A), G).$$

Let r be a representative of α in A. Then $\alpha = [r] = [s^2 r]$ for every $s \in A$, as $\theta|_A(x) = x^{-1}$ so $\delta_x(r) = x^2 r$ in A. We can choose $s \in A$ general enough such that $Z_G(s^2 r) = Z_G(A)$. But then $[r] = [s^2 r] \in H^1(\theta, Z_G(A)) = H^1(\theta, Z_G(s^2 r))$. By Proposition 4.3.4 and the stability of (G, H, θ), we deduce that α is trivial. ■

5. Open Orbits in a Parabolic Quotient

In this section we analyze the relation between the stability of a pair (G, H, θ) and another geometric property which we call p-stability.

Definition 5.0.5. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair. We say that (G, H, θ) is **p-stable** if H has a single open orbit in each parabolic quotient G/P.*

It is clearly sufficient to check p-stability on the minimal parabolic subgroups.

This property is of interest for us since the decomposition of G/P into H orbits carries information on the relative representation theory of H in G. We shall return to the problem of linking p-stability and stability after recalling some machinery from the theory of involutions of reductive groups.

5.1. **Preliminaries on Split Parabolic Subgroups and Split Tori.** We recall some facts and notation regarding parabolic subgroups and tori in symmetric pairs, most of which can be found in [HW93]. For clarity, we shall refer to a subgroup of P as a parabolic subgroup if it is the F-rational points of a parabolic subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ which is defined over F. Sometimes we also refer to such subgroups as parabolic F-subgroups.

Definition 5.1.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{A} \subseteq \boldsymbol{G}$ be a torus defined over F. $\boldsymbol{A}$ is F-split if and only if $X^*(\boldsymbol{A})$ is a trivial Γ_F module.*

The group $\mathbf{G}$ is called **F-split** if it has a maximal torus which is F-split.

All the maximal F-split tori in $\mathbf{G}$ are conjugate by G. Moreover, there exist maximal F-split tori which are θ-stable, and such tori exist in any parabolic subgroup defined over F.

Let $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ be a θ-stable torus defined over F. We denote by $\mathbf{A}^+, \mathbf{A}^-$ its orthogonal and symmetric parts respectively. Similarly, we denote by A^+, A^- the orthogonal and symmetric parts of its F-rational points.

Definition 5.1.2. *A torus $\boldsymbol{A}$ is called θ-split if $\boldsymbol{A} = \boldsymbol{A}^-$.*

Let $g \in G$. We would like to define what it means for g to be "diagonalizable over F".

Definition 5.1.3. *A semi-simple element $g \in G$ is called F-**split** if g is contained in a maximal F-split torus.*

Lemma 5.1.1. *Let $g \in G$ be semi-simple. Then g is F-split if and only if $Z_G(g)$ contains a maximal F-split torus of G.*

Proof. There is a bijection between maximal tori containing g and maximal tori of $Z_G(g)$. The result follows immediately. ■

For us, the most important split elements are those contained in a maximal (θ, F)-torus.

Definition 5.1.4. *A semi-simple element $g \in G$ is called (θ, F)-split if g is contained in a maximal (θ, F)-split torus.*

There is a detailed description of the H orbits in G/P for a minimal parabolic subgroup P, which is given in [HW93]. Since we are interested only in the open orbits, we recall only the part of the theory which is related to them.

Definition 5.1.5. *Let P be a parabolic subgroup of G. Then P is called θ-**split** parabolic subgroup if P and $\theta(P)$ are opposite parabolic subgroups.*

Lemma 5.1.2. *Let P be a θ-split parabolic subgroup of G. Then HP is open in G.*

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that $H \times P \to G$ is submersive at the identity, or that $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{p}$. But as P is θ-split we have

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{p} + d\theta(\mathfrak{p}).$$

The result follows from the simple observation that $d\theta(\mathfrak{p}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p} + \mathfrak{h}$. ■

Remark 5.1.1. *In fact, this is true also with P a parabolic subgroup of a minimal θ-split parabolic subgroup of G. This is essentially proved in* [HW93, Proposition 4.10].

We wish to classify minimal parabolic sungroups $P \subseteq G$ such that HP is open. Recall that every minimal parabolic subgroup of G contains a θ-stable maximal F-split torus, unique up to conjugation by the unipotent radical U_P.

Fix such a torus A and let $A^- := A \cap S$. Then $\Phi(A, G)$ is a root system in $X^*(A)$ and $\Phi(A^-, G)$ is a root system in $X^*(A^-)$. We have a surjection $\pi^- : \Phi(A, G) \to \Phi(A^-, G)$ given by restriction.

Every minimal parabolic subgroup $P \subseteq G$ containing A defines a collection of positive roots $\Phi(A, P) \subseteq \Phi(A, G)$.

We can now state the classification of minimal parabolic subgroups P for which HP is open:

Theorem 5.1.3. *Let P be a minimal parabolic subgroup of G, and let A be a θ-stable maximal F-split torus of G contained in P. Then PH is open in G if and only if $A^- := A \cap S$ is a maximal (θ, F)-split torus of G and $\pi^-(\Phi(A,P))\backslash 0$ is a choice of positive roots in $\Phi(A^-, G)$.*

Proof. First, note that if V is a linear space over $\mathbb{R}$, $C \subseteq V$ is a convex polyhedral cone and $\pi : V \to U$ is a linear projection then $\pi^-(C)$ is again a convex polyhedral cone. Let $C \subseteq X^*(A) \otimes \mathbb{R}$ be the cone spanned by $\Phi(A,P)$. Then since $\Phi(A,G) \subseteq C \cup -C$, we have $\Phi(A^-,G) \subseteq \pi^-(C) \cup \pi^-(-C)$. Thus, since $\pi^-(C)$ is a polyhedral cone, it defines a collection of positive roots in $\Phi(A^-,G)$ if and only if it does not contain antipodal roots. This is equivalent to the condition that for every $\alpha \in \Phi(A,P)$, either $\theta(\alpha) = \alpha$ or $\theta(\alpha) \notin \Phi(A,P)$.

The condition that HP is open in G is equivalent to the infinitesimal condition

$$\mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{g}.$$

Thus, we have to prove that $\mathfrak{h}+\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{g}$ if and only if A^- is a maximal (θ,F)-split torus and for every $\alpha \in \Phi(A,P)$ either $\alpha = \theta(\alpha)$ or $\theta(\alpha)$ is a negative root.

Let $P = MU^+$ be the Levi decomposition of P corresponding to A, i.e. $M = Z_G(A)$ and U^+ is the unipotent radical of P. Let U^- be the unipotent radical of the opposite parabolic subgroup of G containing A. Let K denote the Killing form of $\mathfrak{g}$. Then, with respect to K, we have

$$\mathfrak{h}^\perp = \mathfrak{s}$$
$$\mathfrak{p}^\perp = \mathfrak{u}$$

and therefore

$$(\mathfrak{h}+\mathfrak{p})^\perp = \mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{s}.$$

It follows that HP is open in G if and only if $\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{s} = 0$.

Assume first that $\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{s} = 0$. We have to prove that $A \cap S$ is a maximal (θ,F)-split torus and that the condition on positive roots above is satisfied.

Let $Y \in \mathfrak{s}$ be an element which commutes with $\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{s}$. Let $Y = Y_0 + \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi(A,G)} Y_\alpha$ be a decomposition of Y into a sum of root vectors. Since Y commutes with $\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{s}$, $Y_\alpha = 0$ unless $\theta(\alpha) = \alpha$. It follows that

$$Y = Y_0 + \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi(A,G)^\theta} Y_\alpha.$$

Since $Y \in \mathfrak{s}$ we get that

$$Y_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \cap \mathfrak{s} \subseteq \mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{s} = 0.$$

It follows that $Y \in \mathfrak{m}$, but then by the maximality of $\mathfrak{a}$ we must have $Y \in \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{s}$. This proves the maximality of $A \cap S$.

We next show that for every $\alpha \in \Phi(A,P)$ either $\theta(\alpha) = \alpha$ or $\theta(\alpha) < 0$. This is straight forward: if $\alpha \neq \theta(\alpha) > 0$ then

$$0 \neq (\mathfrak{g}_\alpha + \mathfrak{g}_{\theta(\alpha)}) \cap \mathfrak{s} \subseteq \mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{s} = 0$$

so we get a contradiction.

Conversely, assume that A^- is maximal and that for no $\alpha \in \Phi(A,P)$, $\alpha \neq \theta(\alpha) > 0$. We have to prove that $\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{s} = 0$.

Clearly, $\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{s} \subseteq \mathfrak{u} \cap \theta(\mathfrak{u})$. since $\mathfrak{u} \cap \theta(\mathfrak{u})$ is spanned by the $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ for which α and $\theta(\alpha)$ are both positive, by the assumption on the roots we deduce that

$$\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{s} = \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi(A,P)^\theta} (\mathfrak{g}_\alpha \cap \mathfrak{s}).$$

Thus, it is sufficient to prove that $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha \cap \mathfrak{s} = 0$ for every $\alpha \in \Phi(A,P)^\theta$.

If $0 \neq Y \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \cap \mathfrak{s}$ then as in [AG09, Lemma 7.1.11] we can extend Y to an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ triple (X,F,Y) such that $X \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \cap \mathfrak{s}$ and $F \in \mathfrak{h}$. Since $\alpha = \theta(\alpha)$, X and Y commute with A^-. But then $\mathfrak{a}^- + span\{X+Y\}$ is a (θ,F)-split torus in $\mathfrak{g}$ porperly including $\mathfrak{a}^-$, contrary to the maximality of $\mathfrak{a}^-$. ∎

The following result is useful for the classification of H-conjugacy classes of minimal θ-split parabolic subgroups.

Proposition 5.1.4. *(*[HW93, proposition 4.9] *Let P, P' be minimal parabolic subgroups of G defined over F, and let Q, Q' be minimal θ-split parabolic subgroups containing P, P' repsectively. If $g \in G$ satisfies $gPg^{-1} = P'$ then $gQg^{-1} = Q'$.*

5.2. **Different Types of Stability.** There are some other notions, related to stability, that we shall consider.

Definition 5.2.1. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair. The pair is:*

- ***s-stable*** *if every $g \in G$ such that $s(g)$ is (θ, F)-split is stable.*
- ***p-stable*** *if H has a unique open orbit in G/P for every parabolic subgroup $P \subseteq G$.*
- ***t-stable*** *if all the θ-stable maximal F-split tori in G which contain a maximal (θ, F) split torus are conjugate by H.*

All these properties are related. Even though not all of them are equivalent, we are able to prove the following scheme of implications:



Implication (1) will be proved in the next section. Implication (4) will be proved in section 7. Implications (2) and (3) will be proved here after some preparation.

Proposition 5.2.1 ([BT65, 4.21])**.** *Let G be a reductive group over a local field F, then all the maximal F-split tori in G are conjugate over F.*

Proposition 5.2.2. [BT65, 4.13.b] *Let G be a reductive group over a local field F. Then all its minimal F-parabolic subgroups are conjugate over F.*

Proposition 5.2.3. *A pair (G, H, θ) is T-stable if and only if all the maximal (θ, F)-split tori in G are H-conjugate.*

Proof. We first prove that t-stability implies the conjugacy of maximal (θ, F)-split tori. Let (G, H, θ) be a t-stable pair. Let A, A' be two maximal (θ, F) split tori in G, we have to show that they are H-conjugate. Let T, T' be θ-stable maximal F-split tori containing A, A' respectively. By the assumption, there is $h \in H$ such that $hTh^{-1} = T'$. But then, as $h \in H$, we have

$$hAh^{-1} = hT^{-}h^{-1} = (hTh^{-1})^{-} = T'^{-} = A'$$

and therefore A, A' are H-conjugate.

Conversely, assume that all the maximal (θ, F)-split tori are H-conjugate. We shall show it is t-stable. Let T, T' be θ-stable maximal F-split tori of G, with T^{-}, T'^{-} maximal (θ, F)-split. Let $A := T^{-}$ and $A' := T'^{-}$. By the assumption, there is $h \in H$ such that $hAh^{-1} = A'$. Therefore, replacing T by hTh^{-1} we may assume that $A = A'$. Let $K := Z_H(A)$. Clearly, K is a reductive subgroup of H. Since T^{+} and T'^{+} are both maximal F-split tori in K, by Proposition 5.2.1 there is $k \in K$ such that $kT^{+}k^{-1} = T'^{+}$. But then $kTk^{-1} = T'$ and T, T' are H-conjugate. ■

Next we want to give an equivalent condition for p-stability. This require some preliminaries on θ-split parabolic subgroups.

Lemma 5.2.4. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair. The minimal θ-split parabolic F-subgroups of G are all conjugate by G.*

Proof. Let Q, Q' be minimal θ-split parabolic F-subgroups of G, and let P, P' be minimal parabolic F-subgroups of G contained in Q, Q' respectively. By Proposition 5.2.2 there is $g \in G$ such that $gPg^{-1} = P'$. But then, by Proposition 5.1.4 we get that $gQg^{-1} = Q'$. ■

Lemma 5.2.5. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair and let Q be a minimal θ-split parabolic F-subgroup of G. Then Q contains a unique maximal (θ, F)-split torus.*

Proof. First note that Q contains a maximal (θ, F)-split torus. Indeed, by [HW93, Proposition 4.7], Q contains a maximal (θ, F)-split torus. Let $A \subseteq Q$ be a maximal (θ, F)-split torus. Then $Q \cap \theta(Q) = Z_G(A)$ and since $Q \cap \theta(Q)$ is reductive, its center is a torus. We then have by the maximality of A, $A = Z(Q \cap \theta(Q))^-$, which depends only on Q. ■

Proposition 5.2.6. *A pair (G, H, θ) is P-stable if and only if all the minimal θ-split parabolic subgroups of G are conjugate by H.*

Proof. First assume that the pair is p-stable. Since all the minimal θ-split parabolic subgroups of G are conjugate by G, the variety of θ-split parabolic subgroups is isomorphic as a G-variety to G/Q for a minimal θ-split parabolic subgroup $Q \subseteq G$. Let P be a minimal parabolic subgroup of G contained in Q. Then we have natural H-equivariant submersion $\pi : G/P \to G/Q$. By the assumption, H has a unique open orbit in G/P and therefore it has an open dense orbit $\mathcal{O} \subseteq G/P$. But then $\pi(\mathcal{O})$ is an open dense orbit of H in G/Q.

We turn to the converse. Note that the p-stability can be checked only for the minimal parabolic F-subgroups, as the projections $G/P \to G/P'$ are submersions for $P \subseteq P'$. Furthermore, as parabolic subgroups are self-normalizing, the variety G/P can be identified with the space of all conjugates of P.

Assume that all minimal θ-split parabolic subgroups of G are H-conjugate. Let P, P' be two minimal parabolic subgroups of G such that HP and HP' are open on G. By [HW93, Proposition 9.2], there are minimal θ-split parabolic F-subgroups Q, Q' containing P, P' respectively. By Proposition 5.2.4, Q, Q' are G-conjugate, hence both correspond to open H-orbits in $Ad_G(Q) \cong G/Q$. By the assumption, there is $h \in H$ such that $hQh^{-1} = Q'$. Replacing P by hPh^{-1}, we may assume that $Q = Q'$.

Let A, A' be θ-stable maximal F-split tori of G contained in P, P' respectively. By Lemma 5.2.5, $A^- = A'^-$. By the conjugacy of maximal split tori in $Z_H(A^-)$, there is $k \in Z_H(A^-)$ such that $kAk^{-1} = A'$. Replacing P by kPk^{-1}, we may assume $A = A'$.

The problem is now reduced to a problem on the root system $\Phi(A, G)$. Let $\pi^- : \Phi(A, G) \to \Phi(A^-, G)$ denote the natural projection. Let Σ, Σ' be the positive roots corresponding to P, P' in $X^*(A)$, respectively. Since both HP and HP' are open in G, we have by Theorem 5.1.3 that A^- is a maximal (θ, F)-split torus in G and that $\pi^-(\Sigma)\backslash\{0\}$ and $\pi^-(\Sigma')\backslash\{0\}$ are collections of positive roots in $\Phi(A^-, G)$. Clearly, both are the positive roots defined by $\Phi(A^-, Q)$, and in particular they are the same choices of positive roots.

We claim that if $\alpha \in \Sigma$ and $\pi^-(\alpha) \neq 0$ then $\alpha \in \Sigma'$. Indeed, let $\alpha \in \Sigma$. If $\alpha \neq \theta(\alpha)$ then $\pi^-(\alpha) \in \Phi(A^-, Q)$. But if $\alpha \notin \Sigma'$ then $\alpha \in -\Sigma'$ which implies that $\pi^-(\alpha) \in -\Phi(A^-, Q)$, a contradiction to the fact that $\Phi(A^-, Q)$ strictly contained in a half-plane. By symmetry we have

$$\Sigma \cap (\pi^-)^{-1}(\Phi(A^-, Q)) = \Sigma' \cap (\pi^-)^{-1}(\Phi(A^-, Q)).$$

Let $\Sigma_H = \Sigma \cap Ker(\pi^-)$ and $\Sigma'_H = \Sigma \cap Ker(\pi^-)$. We wish to prove that there is $h \in N_H(A) \cap Z_H(A^-)$ such that $h(\Sigma_H) = \Sigma'_H$. Then, we would get $h(\Sigma) = \Sigma'$ since h preserves the fibers of π^-.

Consider the projection $\pi^+ : X^*(A) \otimes \mathbb{R} \to X^*(A^+) \otimes \mathbb{R}$. Then $\pi^+|_{Ker(\pi^-)}$ is an isomorphism, so it will be sufficient of prove that we can find $h \in N_H(A)$ such that $h(\pi^+(\Sigma_H)) = \pi^+(\Sigma'_H)$.

We first claim that $\pi^+(\Sigma_H) \subseteq \Phi(A^+, Z_H(A^-))$. Indeed, if $\alpha \in \Sigma_H$ then $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha \subseteq Z_{\mathfrak{h}}(A^-)$ since $\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{s} = 0$.

Next, we claim that π^+ maps $\Phi(A, Z_G(A^-))$ isomorphically into $\Phi(A^+, Z_H(A^-))$. Indeed, $\Phi(A, Z_G(A^-)) = Ker(\pi^-)$ so π^+ is injective on $\Phi(A, Z_G(A^-))$. Furthermore, if $\alpha \in \Phi(A^+, Z_H(A^-))$ and Y is a root vector for α then Y is automatically a root vector for A in $Z_G(A^-)$ corresponding to a root which lifts α, so π^+ is a surjection onto $\Phi(A^+, Z_H(A^-))$.

Finally, we claim that Σ_H is a collection of positive roots in $\Phi(A, Z_G(A^-))$ and therefore $\pi^+(\Sigma_H)$ is a collection of positive roots in $\Phi(A^+, Z_H(A^-))$. To see this, note that Σ_H is a subset of $\Phi(A, Z_G(A^-))$ which is strictly contained in a half-space since Σ is. Moreover,

$$\Phi(A, Z_G(A^-)) \subseteq (\Sigma \cup -\Sigma) \cap Ker(\pi^-) = \Sigma_H \cup -\Sigma_H.$$

This shows that Σ_H is a collection of positive roots. By a similar argument, $\pi^+(\Sigma'_H)$ is a collection of positive roots in $\Phi(A^+, Z_H(A^-))$.

Since A^+ is a maximal F-split torus in $Z_H(A^-)$, $\Phi(A^+, Z_H(A^-))$ is a (maybe non-reduced) root system, and its Weyl group acts transitively on the Weyl chambers. Since both Σ_H and Σ'_H are collections of positive roots in $\Phi(A^+, Z_H(A^-))$ there is a Weyl group element which maps one to the other. In particular, there exists an $h \in N_H(A^+) \cap Z_H(A^-)$ such that $h(\Sigma_H) = \Sigma'_H$. But then $h(\Sigma) = \Sigma'$ so $hPh^{-1} = P'$. It follows that the pair is p-stable. ■

We now turn to the proof of the implications (2) and (3).

Theorem 5.2.7 (Implication (3))**.** *Every p-stable pair is t-stable.*

Proof. Let (G, H, θ) be a p-stable pair. Let A, A' be two maximal (θ, F)-split tori in G. Let Q, Q' be minimal θ-split parabolic F-subgroups of G containing A, A' respectively. As (G, H, θ) is p-stable, by Proposition 5.2.6 there is $h \in H$ such that $hQh^{-1} = Q'$. By Lemma 5.2.5, $hAh^{-1} = A'$. Since by Proposition 5.2.3 the H-conjugacy of all the maximal (θ, F)-split tori is equivalent to T-stability, the pair is T-stable.

■

Theorem 5.2.8 (Implication (2))**.** *Every p-stable pair is s-stable.*

Proof. Assume that (G, H, θ) is p-stable. We have to prove that it is s-stable. Let $r \in S_0$ be a (θ, F)-split element which is the symmetrization of an element g. Let A^- be the unique (θ, F)-split torus such that $Z_G(r) = Z_G(A^-)$. Let P be a parabolic subgroup of G corresponding to a choice of positive roots in $\Phi(A^-, G)$. G/P is isomorphic as a G-variety to the variety of all conjugates of P since P is self-normalizing.

Let $P' = g^{-1}Pg$. We claim that both P and P' has open H-orbits in G/P. Indeed, by construction P is θ-split, as $P \cap \theta(P) = Z_G(A^-)$ is a Levi-subgroup. But

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(P') = \sigma(g)\theta(P)\theta(g) = & \qquad (g\sigma(g) = r) \\ g^{-1}r\theta(P)r^{-1}g = & \qquad (r \in P \cap \theta(P)) \\ = g^{-1}\theta(P)g. & \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\theta(P') \cap P' = g^{-1}(P \cap \theta(P))g$ is a Levi subgroup of G, so P' and $\theta(P')$ are opposite. We deduce that HP' is open in G, so P' has open H-conjugacy class, and in fact is θ-split parabolic subgroup of G.

Since (G, H, θ) is p-stable and by Proposition 5.2.6, there is $h \in H$ such that $hPh^{-1} = P' = g^{-1}Pg$. It follows that gh normalizes P. Since P is self-normalizing, $gh \in P$. Since $r = s(g) = s(gh)$ we may assume that $g \in P$.

Consider the semi-direct decomposition $P = M_P \cdot U_P$ where $M_P = Z_G(A^-)$ is the Levi part of P and U_P is the unipotent radical. We can decompose g as $g = um$ where $u \in U_P$ and $m \in M_P$ (as the product is semi direct the factors can be interchanged!). We get

$$r = s(g) = g\sigma(g) = u(m\sigma(m))\sigma(u).$$

Both the left hand side and the right hand side are Bruhat decompositions of r, so by the uniqueness of Bruhat decomposition we must have $m\sigma(m) = r$. But $m \in Z_G(A^-) = Z_G(r)$ so r is a symmetrization of an element of its centralizer. By Proposition 4.3.3 r is stable. ■

In some cases, we can prove that t-stability and s-stability together imply the p-stability of a pair. Yet we can prove this only in the case that G is connected in the Zariski toplology, split reductive and contains a θ-split Borel subgroup.

Theorem 5.2.9. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair, and assume that $\boldsymbol{G}$ is s split reductive connected algebraic group and that G contains a θ-split Borel subgroup. If (G, H, θ) is t-stable and s-stable, then in is also p-stable.*

Proof. First note that in this case the minimal θ-split parabolic subgroups are precisely the θ-split Borel subgroups of G. Thus,by Proposition 5.2.6 it will be sufficient to prove that every two θ-split Borel subgroups of G are H-conjugate. Let B,B' be θ-split Borel subgroups. Let A, A' be θ-stable maximal F-split tori of G contained in B, B' respectively. Since the pair is t-stable we may assume that $A = A'$.

By the transitivity of the action of the Weyl group on the Weyl chambers, there exists $w \in W_G(A)$ such that $w(\Phi(A, B)) = \Phi(A, B')$. But then since both B and B' are θ-split,

$$-\theta(w)(\Phi(A, B)) = \theta(w)(\theta(\Phi(A, B))) = \theta(w(\Phi(A, B))) = \theta(\Phi(A, B')) = -\Phi(A, B')$$

so

$$\theta(w)(\Phi(A, B)) = \Phi(A, B') = w(\Phi(A, B))$$

and since the action of the Weyl group on the Weyl chambers is free we deduce that

$$\theta(\omega) = \omega.$$

Let $g \in N_G(A)$ be a representative of w. Then $r := s(g) \in Z_G(A) = A$ since G is split and connected. It follows that $s(g) \in A \cap S = A^-$.

For every $y \in A^-$ we have $s(yg) = yg\theta(g)^{-1}y = yry = ry^2$. We can choose $y \in A^-$ for which $Z_G(ry^2) = Z_G(A^-)$, since the set of y-s for which the last equality does not hold is a union of countably many closed sets with empty interior. Replacing g with yg we may assume that $Z_G(r) = Z_G(A^-)$.

Since the pair is s-stable and r is a θ-split symmetrization, we have $r = s(z)$ for $z \in Z_G(r) = Z_G(A^-)$. The equality $s(g) = s(z)$ implies that $z = gh$ for some $h \in H$ so replacing B with $h^{-1}Bh$ we may assume that $g = z$, so $zBz^{-1} = B'$

It follows that $\Phi(A^-, B) = \Phi(A^-, B')$ since $\Phi(A, B)$ and $\Phi(A, B')$ are conjugate by $Z_G(A^-)$, which preserves the fibers of the map $\pi^- : \Phi(A, G) \to \Phi(A^-, G)$.

Since B is θ-split we have $\Phi(A, B) = (\pi^-)^{-1}(\Phi(A^-, B))$, and similarly $\Phi(A, B') = (\pi^-)^{-1}(\Phi(A^-, B'))$. Since $\Phi(A^-, B) = \Phi(A^-, B')$, we deduce that $\Phi(A, B) = \Phi(A, B')$ so $B = B'$ and the pair is p-stable. ■

5.3. **Verification Methods for Stability.** In the next section we will check the different kinds of stability for many interesting symmetric pairs. Therefore, we would like to describe the methods we use to verify each of these properties.

We have the first and second invariants, which in principle allows us to check stability. In general this is done by considering the different subgroups (maybe non-split ones), which form the stabilizers of semi-simple symmetric elements and computing their cohomologies. For s-stability we have the following cohomological criterion:

Theorem 5.3.1. *A symmetric pair (G, H, θ) is s-stable if and only if for every maximal (θ, F)-split torus $A \subseteq G$,*

$$IH^1(\theta, A, Z_G(A)) \cap KH^1(\theta, Z_G, G) = 1. \tag{5}$$

Proof. In one direction, suppose that the pair is s-stable. If

$$r \in IH^1(\theta, A, Z_G(A)) \cap KH^1(\theta, Z_G, G),$$

then since $[r]$ is trivial in $H^1(\theta, G)$, r is a symmetrization in G and the stability of the pair implies that $[r]$ is the trivial cocycle of $Z_G(r)$. Replacing r by rs^2 for $s \in A$ has no effect on the cohomology

class of r in $Z_G(A)$, but we can choose s such that $Z_G(s^2 r) = Z_G(A)$. Therefore, $[r]$ is the trivial class even in $H^1(\theta, Z_G(A))$, and we got that

$$IH^1(\theta, A, Z_G(A)) \cap KH^1(\theta, Z_G, G) = 1.$$

The other direction is easier. Let r be a (θ, F)-split element and let A be a maximal (θ, F)-split torus containing r. By the assumption $[r]$ is trivial in $H^1(\theta, Z_G(A))$, so as $Z_G(A) \subseteq Z_G(r)$, $[r]$ is trivial in $H^1(\theta, Z_G(r))$. ■

Next, consider the t-stability property. In order to give a cohomological criterion for it, we need a fact about the conjugacy of (θ, F)-split tori.

Proposition 5.3.2. [HW93, Lemma 10.3] *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair. All the (θ, F)-split tori in G are conjugate by elements of G.*

Theorem 5.3.3. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair, and let A be a maximal (θ, F)-split torus in G. The maximal (θ, F)-split tori in G are classified up to H-conjugacy be the set*

$$IH^1(\theta, Z_G(A), N_G(A)) \cap KH^1(\theta, N_G(A), G).$$

In particular, the pair is T-stable if and only if

$$IH^1(\theta, Z_G(A), N_G(A)) \cap KH^1(\theta, N_G(A), G) = 1. \tag{6}$$

Proof. Set $X = IH^1(\theta, Z_G(A), N_G(A)) \cap KH^1(\theta, N_G(A), G)$. Let $\mathcal{T}$ denote the set tori $A \subseteq G$ which conjugate to a maximal (θ, F)-split torus in G. Let A be any maximal (θ, F)-split torus in G and take it to be the base point of $\mathcal{T}$. By Proposition 5.3.3, G acts transitively on $\mathcal{T}$ by conjugation. We have a natural action of θ on $\mathcal{T}$ via $A \mapsto \theta(A)$. By Theorem 3.2.2 we have

$$\mathcal{T}^\theta / Ad_H \cong KH^1(\theta, N_G(A), G)$$

Under this identification, the torus $A' = gAg^{-1}$ corresponds to the cocycle $g^{-1}\theta(g) \in Z^1(\theta, N_G(A))$. We wish to determine those g for which gAg^{-1} is maximal (θ, F)-split. This is the case exactly when $\theta(gag^{-1}) = ga^{-1}g^{-1}$ for every $a \in A$. But $\theta(a) = a^{-1}$ for $a \in A$ so in this case $\theta(g)a^{-1}\theta(g)^{-1} = ga^{-1}g^{-1}$ which means that $g^{-1}\theta(g)$ commutes with a for every $a \in A$. Thus, the cocycles corresponding with maximal (θ, F)-split tori are exactly these which live in $IH^1(\theta, Z_G(A), N_H(A))$. ■

Finally, we treat the p-stability.

Theorem 5.3.4. *The H-conjugacy classes of minimal θ-split parabolic subgroups of G are in 1-1 correspondence with the set*

$$KH^1(\theta, Z_G(A), G)$$

for a maximal (θ, F)-split torus. In particular, the pair (G, H, θ) is p-stable if and only if

$$KH^1(\theta, Z_G(A), G) = 1.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the set of minimal θ-split parabolic subgroups of G. Let P be a minimal θ-split parabolic subgroup of G. Consider G/P as the variety of conjugates of P. Let θ acts on $G/P \times G/P$ by $\tilde{\theta}(P', P'') = (\theta(P''), \theta(P'))$. Let $\Delta_\theta = (G/P \times G/P)^\theta$. Let $\mathcal{O} \subseteq G/P \times G/P$ denote the unique open G-orbit which consists of pairs (P', P'') of opposite parabolic subgroups.

By Proposition 5.2.4, the minimal θ-split parabolic subgroups are all conjugates P. Let $\pi_1 : G/P \times G/P \to G/P$ be the projection onto the first factor. We deduce that $\mathcal{P} \cong \pi_1(\Delta_\theta \cap \mathcal{O})$. Since $\pi_1|_{\Delta_\theta}$ is injective and H-equivariant, we have

$$\mathcal{P}/Ad_H \cong (\Delta_\theta \cap \mathcal{O})/H \cong \mathcal{O}^\theta / H.$$

By Theorem 3.2.2 we get

$$\mathcal{P}/Ad_H \cong \mathcal{O}^{\tilde{\theta}}/H \cong KH^1(\theta, Stb_G(P, \theta(P)), G)$$

since we can choose the base-point of $\mathcal{O}$ to be $(P, \theta(P))$. But

$$Stb_G((P, \theta(P))) = N_G(P) \cap N_G(\theta(P)) = P \cap \theta(P) = Z_G(A^-)$$

where A^- is a maximal (θ, F)-split torus contained in P, by [HW93, Lemma 4.6]. We deduce that

$$\mathcal{P}/H \cong KH^1(\theta, Z_G(A), G).$$

■

Remark 5.3.1. *In fact, all the relation between the different stability types can be deduced easily from the cohomological criteria. We decided to give a direct proofs for the implications (2) and (3) because they was not much longer than the cohomological proofs but much more explicit.*

At this point, we are ready to prove the remaining implication between stabilities, namely that stability implies p-stability. Before we prove it, we need a lemma:

Lemma 5.3.5. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair, and let $x \in H^1(\theta, G)$. Then x can be represented by a semi-simple element.*

Proof. Let r be a representative of x, and let $r = r_s r_u$ be a Jordan decomposition of it. Let U be a unipotent F-group containing r_u which centralizes r_s, e.g. the Zariski closure of the subgroup generated by r_u. Then, by [HW93, Lemma 0.6] we have $r_u = y^{-1}\theta(y)$ for some $y \in U$. But then, as y commutes with r_s we get $x = [r] = [r_s r_u] = [y^{-1} r_s \theta(y)] = [r_s]$ in $H^1(\theta, G)$. ■

Theorem 5.3.6 (Implication (1))**.** *A stable symmetric pair is p-stable.*

Proof. Let (G, H, θ) be a stable pair. In view of the cohomological criterion for p-stability (Theorem 5.3.4), it will be sufficient to prove that, for a maximal (θ, F)-split torus A, the natural mapping $H^1(\theta, Z_G(A)) \to H^1(\theta, G)$ has trivial kernel.

Let $[r] \in KH^1(\theta, Z_G(A), G)$. We shall prove that there exists $s \in A$ such that

$$Z_G(rs^2) \subseteq Z_G(A).$$

Let $\mathbf{T}$ be the torus topologically generated in the Zariski topology by r and A. Then $\mathbf{T}$ is defined over F. There is a finite field extension E/F over which $\mathbf{T}$ splits. Let $X^*(\mathbf{T})(E)$ the the set of E-rational characters of $\mathbf{T}$. For every $s \in A$ consider the torus $\overline{\{r^l s^{2l}\}_{l \in \mathbb{Z}}}$. Since A is F-split we have $X^*(\mathbf{A})(E) \cong X^*(A)$ via restriction. The condition that $\mathbf{A}(E) \not\subseteq \overline{\{r^l s^{2l}\}_{l \in \mathbb{Z}}}$ is equivalent to the condition that there exists $\xi \in X^*(\mathbf{A})(E)$ such that $\xi(rs^2) = 1$ but $\xi|_A \neq 1$. The first equation can be written as

$$\xi(s)^2 = \xi(r)^{-1}.$$

For each rational character ξ the last equation cuts a closed set of A (in the t-topology) with empty interior. As A is a complete metric space it follows by the Baire category theorem that there is $s \in A$ which violates all these conditions simultaneously. Then $[r] = [\delta_{s^{-1}}(r)] = [rs^2]$ is in $KH^1(\theta, Z_G(A), G)$ and is semi-simple. Furthermore, the stability of the pair implies that $[rs^2]$ is trivial in $H^1(\theta, Z_G(rs^2))$ so it also vanishes in $H^1(\theta, Z_G(A))$. Since $[r] = [rs^2]$, we deduce that $[r]$ is trivial in $H^1(\theta, Z_G(A))$. ■

Empirically, it seems that in the Archimedean case, at least if G is connected, the converse also holds.

Conjecture 5.3.7. *If (G, H, θ) is a p-stable symmetric pair over $\mathbb{R}$ and G is connected in the real topology, then (G, H, θ) is stable.*

Remark 5.3.2. *We hope that some special features of the cohomology of real pairs might help, such as the results in* [Ad00].

We now illustrate the usage of the cohomological method by an example.

Example 5.3.1. *Not every p-stable pair is stable. For example, let* $p \equiv 3 \mod 4$ *and consider the pair* (G, H, θ) *where* G *is the quaternions of norm 1 in the quaternion algebra* $\mathbb{Q}_p[i,j]/(\{i^2 = p, j^2 = -1, ij = -ji\}) := \mathbb{H}[p,-1]$*, and* $\theta(x) = ixi^{-1} = \frac{ixi}{p}$*. This pair is clearly P, S and t-stable because there are no parabolic subgroups or split tori or split elements at all. However, the pair is not stable as we shall prove in the next theorem.*

Theorem 5.3.8. *The pair* (G, H, θ) *in Example 5.3.1 is unstable for every* $p \equiv 3 \mod 4$*.*

Proof. Consider the maximal θ-split torus $A = \{x \in G : x = a + bk\}$ where $k := ij$. We claim that $KH^1(\theta, A, G) \neq 1$, and therefore by Theorem 4.3.5 the pair is not stable, since it is straight forward to check that $Z_G(A) = A$.

Let $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{H}[p,-1]$ denote the quaternion algebra, then we have an exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow G \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}^\times \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q}_p^\times \longrightarrow 1,$$

where the right arrow is the reduced norm $N_{\mathbb{H}/\mathbb{Q}_p}(x+iy+jz+kw) := x^2+y^2-p(z^2+w^2)$. Moreover, we have an exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q}_p[k]^\times \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow 1$$

where B is the subgroup of $\mathbb{Q}_p^\times$ generated by the norms from $\mathbb{Q}_p[k]$. These are the elements with the least significant digit a square mod p. The two short exact sequences fit into a commutative diagram of sequences:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 1 & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Q}_p[k]^\times & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & 1 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & G & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{H}^\times & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Q}_p^\times & \longrightarrow & 1 \end{array}$$

Note that $(\mathbb{H}^\times)^\theta = \mathbb{Q}_p[i]^\times$. Using the isomorphism in Theorem 3.2.2 for both horizontal lines, where we let the middle groups act on the groups on the right, we obtain a commutative square with injective horizontal arrows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B/(\mathbb{Q}_p^\times)^2 & \hookrightarrow & H^1(\theta, A) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{Q}_p^\times / N_{\mathbb{H}/\mathbb{Q}_p}(\mathbb{Q}_p[i]^\times) & \hookrightarrow & H^1(\theta, G) \end{array}$$

Namely, here the active groups are $\mathbb{Q}_p[k]^\times$ and $\mathbb{H}^\times$ and they act on B and $\mathbb{Q}_p^\times$ respectively.

The upper horizontal map is an isomorphism, since by Hilbert's 90 Theorem

$$H^1(\theta, \mathbb{Q}_p[k]^\times) = 1.$$

It is therefore sufficient to show that $B/(\mathbb{Q}_p^\times)^2$ is non-trivial and the map

$$B/(\mathbb{Q}_p^\times)^2 \to \mathbb{Q}_p^\times / N(\mathbb{Q}_p[i]^\times))$$

is trivial. Indeed, by the diagram above and the fact that the upper arrow is an isomorphism, $KH^1(\theta, A, G)$ is isomorphic to the kernel of the map $B/(\mathbb{Q}_p^\times)^2 \to \mathbb{Q}_p^\times / N(\mathbb{Q}_p[i])^\times$ which appears in the upper part of the diagram.

But it is immediate that

$$B/(\mathbb{Q}_p^\times)^2 \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$$

and that the left hand side is generated by $-p$. Since $-p = N(i) \in N(\mathbb{Q}_p[i]^\times)$, the mapping

$$B/(\mathbb{Q}_p^\times)^2 \to \mathbb{Q}_p^\times / N(\mathbb{Q}_p[i]^\times))$$

is trivial, and the pair is unstable. ∎

6. Calculations

In this section we always assume that $F = \mathbb{R}$ or that F is non-Archimedean. Since all the complex pairs are stable, these are the only interesting cases.

In this section we apply the methods developed in the article to check the stability of many interesting pairs. For the pairs we consider, we check s-stability, p-stability and stability. We do not mention t-stability as it is unrelated to the Gelfand property, as far as we know. Note, however, that the p-stable pairs are automatically t-stable.

During the calculation, we will use extensively the different cohomological criteria for the various kinds stability, sometimes implicitly.

Before we treat particular pairs, we shall present some notation and results which we shall use in many of the examples.

6.1. **Preliminaries.**

6.1.1. *Linear Algebra and Eigenvalues.* To each point $\lambda \in spec(F[x])$ there is a unique monic irreducible polynomial $m_\lambda(x)$ generating the maximal ideal associated with the point λ.

Let V be a linear space over a field F. Let r be a semi-simple automorphism of V. There is a decomposition

$$V = \oplus_{\lambda \in spec(F[x])} V_\lambda(r)$$

where $V_\lambda(r) = \{v \in V : m_\lambda(r)v = 0\}$. We think of λ as a point of the algebraic closure $\bar{F}$, well defined only up to the action of $\Gamma_{\bar{F}/F}$. The space $V_\lambda(r)$ will be referred to as primary space with primary-value λ. The decomposition $V = \oplus_{\lambda \in spec(F[x])} V_\lambda(r)$ will be referred to as the primary decomposition of V with respect to r.

For $\lambda \in spec(F[x])$, let $F_\lambda \cong F[x]/(m_\lambda(x))$ denote the residue field of $specF[x]$ at λ. If we consider λ as an element of $\bar{F}$ then this field is just $F[\lambda]$. The spaces $V_\lambda(r)$ come endowed with a canonical structure of an F_λ vector space, given by $p(x)v := p(r)v$ for p a polynomial over F, considered as an element of F_λ. Under this identification r is given by multiplication by λ when we think of λ as an element of $\bar{F}$.

If $h \in GL(V)$ is an element such that $hr = r^{-1}h$, then $h|_{V_\lambda}$ gives rise to an isomorphism $V_\lambda \to V_{\lambda^{-1}}$. We have 3 options for the interrelation of h and the primary subspaces:

- λ and λ^{-1} are different points of $spec(F[x])$. In this case $h|_{V_\lambda(r)} : V_\lambda(r) \xrightarrow{\cong} V_{\lambda^{-1}(r)}$. The set of primary values of this type will be called primary values of type A.
- λ and λ^{-1} are different as elements of $\bar{F}$, but correspond to the same point of $spec(F[x])$. In this case $V_\lambda = V_{\lambda^{-1}}$ and h is an F-linear automorphism of it. We can consider Ad_h as an automorphism of $F_\lambda \cong F[r]$ (with the action of conjugating r), and then h is a semi-linear automorphism of $V_\lambda(r)$ over F_λ, corresponding to the non-trivial automorphism of $F[\lambda]$ over $F[\lambda + \lambda^{-1}]$. The set of primary values of this type will be called primary values of type B.
- $\lambda = \pm 1$. In this case $h|_{V_\lambda(r)}$ commutes with $r|_{V_\lambda(r)}$. The set of primary values of this type will be called primary values of type C.

We shall denote by $\mathcal{A}(r), \mathcal{B}(r), \mathcal{C}(r)$ the sets on primary values of type A, B, C of r respectively. The set $\mathcal{A}(r)$ consists of pairs of the form (λ, λ^{-1}). We shall denote by $\mathcal{A}^+(r)$ any choice of an element from each pair, and by $U_\lambda(r)$ the linear space $V_\lambda(r) + V_{\lambda^{-1}}(r)$.

Lemma 6.1.1. *Let $r \in GL(V)$ and let $h \in GL(V)$ such that $h^2 = Id_V$ and $hrh^{-1} = r^{-1}$. Then*

$$dim(V_1(h)) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{A}(r) \cup \mathcal{B}(r)} dim(V_\lambda(r))\right) + dim(V_1(r) \cap V_1(h)) + dim(V_{-1}(r) \cap V_1(h))$$

and

$$dim(V_1(rh)) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{\lambda\in\mathcal{A}(r)\cup\mathcal{B}(r)} dim(V_\lambda(r))\right) + dim(V_1(r)\cap V_1(h)) + dim(V_{-1}(r)\cap V_{-1}(h))$$

Proof. Since for each primary value λ of r the space $V_\lambda(r)+V_{\lambda^{-1}}(r)$ is rh-invariant and h-invariant, it is enough to prove the statement of the lemma for each such subspace separately. If λ is of type A, then h and rh map $V_\lambda(r)$ isomorphically into $V_{\lambda^{-1}}(r)$ and vice versa. Therefore, the maps $v\mapsto v+h(v)$ and $v\mapsto v+rh(v)$ give linear isomorphisms of $V_\lambda(r)$ with $(V_\lambda(r)+V_{\lambda^{-1}}(r))\cap V_1(h)$ and $(V_\lambda(r)+V_{\lambda^{-1}}(r))\cap V_1(rh)$ respectively. It follows that

$$dim((V_\lambda(r)+V_{\lambda^{-1}}(r))\cap V_1(h)) = dim(V_\lambda(r)) = \frac{1}{2}dim(V_\lambda(r)+V_{\lambda^{-1}}(r)),$$

so the formula is correct in that case.

Next assume that λ is of type B. Then $V_\lambda(r)=V_{\lambda^{-1}}(r)$ and $V_\lambda(r)$ has a structure of a F_λ vector space, with h being a semi-linear automorphism, and the same is true for rh. It follows from Hilbert's 90 Theorem that $V_1(h)\cap V_\lambda(r)\otimes_{F[r+r^{-1}]}F[r]\cong V_\lambda(r)$ and since $F[r]/F[r+r^{-1}]$ is a quadratic extension it follows that

$$dim(V_1(h)\cap V_\lambda(r)) = \frac{1}{2}dim(V_\lambda).$$

The case where λ is of type C is immediate: if $\lambda=1$ then $rh=h$ on $V_\lambda(r)$ and if $\lambda=-1$ then $rh=-h$ on $V_\lambda(r)$. ■

6.1.2. *Quadratic Forms.* Here we list some results about quadratic forms, necessary for the analysis of the stability of symmetric pairs of orthogonal and unitary groups.

Let V be a linear space over F. Let $Quad(V)$ denote the set of symmetric bilinear forms $B: V\times V\to F$. We identify B with its associated quadratic form $v\mapsto B(v,v)$ and write it simply as $B(v)$. If $B'\in Quad(U)$ we say that the pair (V,B) is equivalent to (U,B') if there is a linear isomorphism $A:V\to U$ such that $B(u,v)=B'(Au,Av)$. Let $\mathcal{QF}_n(F)$ denote the set of equivalence classes of pairs (B,V) of a space with a quadratic form on it such that $dim(V)=n$. For every quadratic form $B\in Quad(V)$, we let $[B]$ denote the class of (V,B) in $\mathcal{QF}_{dim(V)}(F)$. There is a natural direct sum map $\oplus:\mathcal{QF}_n(F)\times\mathcal{QF}_m(F)\to\mathcal{QF}_{n+m}(F)$ given by orthogonal direct sum of forms. Let $\mathcal{QF}(F)$ be the set of equivalence classes of quadratic forms of any rank, i.e. the union of all the $\mathcal{QF}_n(F)$-s.

If B is a quadratic form on V and $g:V\to V$ is a linear map such that $B(gv,u)=B(v,gu)$ for every $v,u\in V$ then we denote by B_g the quadratic form $B_g(u,v)=B(gu,v)$.

There is a natural map

$$Q_n:(F^\times/(F^\times)^2)^n\to\mathcal{QF}_n(F)$$

given by $Q_n([a_1,...,a_n])=(F^n,\sum_{i=1}^n a_ix_i^2)$. Diagonalization of quadratic forms shows that this map is onto. We let $Q:\coprod_n F^\times/(F^\times)^2)^n\to\mathcal{QF}(F)$ be the union of these maps. Note that Q is not injective, as clearly several different sequences might correspond to the same form.

Let $\{a,b\}$ denote the Hilbert symbol of a and b, defined by

$$\{a,b\}=\begin{cases}1, & \exists x,y\in F: ax^2+by^2=1\\ -1, & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}.$$

We have several invariants on quadratic forms. For $B\in Quad(V)$ let:

- $det(B)\in F^\times/(F^\times)^2$ be the determinant of B, represented as a matrix in some basis of V.
- $rank(B)=dim(V)$.
- $H(B)$ be the Hasse invariant of B, i.e. the product of all the Hilbert symbols of pairs of diagonal elements of B in some orthogonal basis.
- $\mu(B)$ the maximal dimension of a subspace $U\subseteq V$ such that $B|_U=0$.

One can show that all these are preserved by equivalence, and thus induce maps

$$rank : \mathcal{QF}(F) \to \mathbb{N}$$
$$det : \mathcal{QF}(F) \to F^\times/(F^\times)^2$$
$$H : \mathcal{QF}(F) \to \{\pm 1\}$$
$$\mu : \mathcal{QF}(F) \to \mathbb{N}$$

Define similarly on sequences of elements of $F^\times/(F^\times)^2$

$$rank([a_1, ..., a_n]) = n$$
$$det([a_1, ..., a_n]) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} a_i$$
$$H([a_1, ..., a_n]) = \prod_{1\le i<j\le n} \{a_i, a_j\}$$

so that for every sequence ℓ of elements of $F^\times/(F^\times)^2$ we have $rank(\ell) = rank(Q(\ell))$, $det(\ell) = det(Q(\ell))$ and $H(\ell) = H(Q(\ell))$.

For non-Archimedean fields, it turns out to be a complete set of invariants.

Theorem 6.1.2 ([Ser73, Theorem 2.3.7])**.** *A quadratic form over a local non-Archimedean field of characteristic 0 is completely determined up to equivalence by its rank, determinant and Hasse invariant.*

In the case $F = \mathbb{R}$ this is not the case but Sylvester Theorem states that the rank and signature form a complete set of invariants for quadratic forms.

The following classical result will be useful in some cohomology computations:

Theorem 6.1.3 (Witt Cancellation Theorem)**.** *Let B, B', C be three quadratic forms over F. If $B \oplus C \equiv B' \oplus C$ then $B \equiv B'$. In other words, $\cdot \oplus C : \mathcal{QF}(F) \to \mathcal{QF}(F)$ is injective.*

We shall say that $B \le B'$ if there is a quadratic form C such that $B' \equiv B \oplus C$. In this case, by Witt Cancellation Theorem we can unambiguously define difference $[B] - [B']$ to be $[C]$.

Let V be a linear space over F and V^* the dual space. We associate with V the **hyperbolic form** $\mathcal{H}_V$ on $V \oplus V^*$ given by $\mathcal{H}_V(v + \phi) = \phi(v)$. Its class depends only on $n = dim(V)$ and we denote $\mathcal{H}_n = [\mathcal{H}_{F^n}]$. Clearly $\mathcal{H}_n = \oplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_1$.

We say that a scalar $x \in F$ is **represented by** B if there is $v \in V$ such that $B(v) = x$. As $B(bv) = b^2 B(v)$ the set of scalars represented by B is a union of $(F^\times)^2$ orbits. Let $Rep(B)$ denote the set of $(F^\times)^2$ orbits of elements $x \in F$ represented by B. As $Rep(B)$ depends only on the equivalence class of B it can be regarded as a function

$$Rep : \mathcal{QF}(F) \to SubSets(F/(F^\times)^2).$$

Clearly $Rep(\mathcal{H}_V) = F/(F^\times)^2$.

The following result follows from the classical Witt Decomposition Theorem. We give the proof nevertheless.

Proposition 6.1.4. *Let B be a quadratic form and k the maximal integer such that $\mathcal{H}_k \le B$. Then $k = \mu(B)$.*

Proof. On one hand $\mu(\mathcal{H}_k) = k$, so if $\mathcal{H}_k \le B$ then

$$k = \mu(\mathcal{H}_k) \le \mu(B).$$

On the other hand, if $\mu(B) = k$ there are linear independent vectors $v_1, ..., v_k \in V$ such that $B(v_i, v_j) = 0$ for all $1 \le i, j \le k$. Let $u_i \in V$ be vectors such that $B(u_i, v_j) = \delta_{i,j}$. Let $u_i' = u_i - \sum_j \frac{B(u_i,u_j)}{2} v_j$. Then $B(u_i') = 0$ and $B(u_i', v_j) = \delta_{i,j}$, so $B|_{span\{u_i', v_j\}_{i,j=1}^k} \equiv \mathcal{H}_k$. This shows that $\mathcal{H}_k \le B$. ∎

Let E/F be a finite extension. Let V be a linear space over F and $V(E)$ the extension of scalars form F to E of V. We have a map $Quad(V) \to Quad(V(E))$ given by extension of scalars. Namely, B_E is the unique symmetric E-bilinear form on $V(E)$ which coincides with B on V. The image is clearly the set of forms B for which $B(V,V) \subseteq F$.

Now let U be a linear space over E and let $U|_F$ denote the restriction of scalar to F. There is a natural map $Tr_{E/F} : Quad(U) \to Quad(U|_F)$ given by

$$Tr_{E/F}(B)(u,v) := Tr_{E/F}(B(u,v)).$$

Proposition 6.1.5. *The mapping $Tr_{E/F}$ is injective. Its image is the set of those forms $B : U \times U \to F$ for which $B(\lambda u, v) = B(u, \lambda v)$ for each $\lambda \in E$.*

Proof. If $B \neq 0$ then there exist $u, v \in V(E)$ such that $B(u,v) = c \neq 0$. But then $0 = Tr_{E/F}(B(u, c^{-1}v)) = Tr_{E/F}(1) = [E:F] \neq 0$ since $char(F) = 0$, so $Tr_{E/F}(B) \neq 0$. Thus, $Ker(Tr_{E/F}) = 0$ and therefore $Tr_{E/F}$ is injective.

For the description of the image, it is clear that $Tr_{E/F}(B)$ has the indicated property. Conversely, let B be an F-quadratic form on U for which $B(\lambda u, v) = B(u, \lambda v)$ for every $\lambda \in E$. Let $x_1, ..., x_k$ be a basis of E over F and let $x_1^*, ..., x_n^*$ be a dual basis with respect to the trace form, i.e. $Tr_{E/F}(x_i x_j^*) = \delta_{i,j}$. Define the (a priori only F-bilinear) form

$$\tilde{B}(u,v) = \sum_i x_i^* B(u, x_i v).$$

Then $\tilde{B}$ is in fact symmetric, E-bilinear and $Tr_{E/F}(\tilde{B}) = B$. The symmetry of $\tilde{B}$ follows easily from the assumption that $B(\lambda u, v) = B(u, \lambda v)$ for $\lambda \in E$. To see that $\tilde{B}$ is E-bilinear, we use the identity

$$y = \sum_i x_i^* Tr_{E/F}(y x_i)$$

and compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{B}(u, \lambda v) = \sum_i x_i^* B(u, \lambda x_i v) = \\
&\sum_i x_i^* B(u, \sum_j Tr_{E/F}(\lambda x_i x_j^*) x_j v) = \sum_{i,j} x_i^* Tr_{E/F}(\lambda x_i x_j^*) B(u, x_j v) = \\
&= \sum_i x_i^* Tr_{E/F}(\sum_j (\lambda x_j^* B(u, x_j v)) \cdot x_i) = \lambda \sum_j (x_j^* B(u, x_j v)) = \\
&= \lambda \tilde{B}(u,v)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the fact that $Tr_{E/F}(\tilde{B}) = B$ follows similarly:

$$\begin{aligned}
&Tr_{E/F}(\tilde{B}(u,v)) = Tr_{E/F}(\sum_i x_i^* B(u, x_i v)) = \\
&= \sum_i B(u, x_i v) Tr_{E/F}(x_i^*) = B(u, (\sum_i Tr_{E/F}(x_i^* \cdot 1) x_i) \cdot v) = \\
&= B(u,v)
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that B is in the image of $Tr_{E/F}$. ∎

6.1.3. *Hermitian Forms.* Let E/F be a quadratic extension. Let $c : E \to E$ be the unique non-trivial automorphism over F., Let U be a vector space over E. An F-bilinear form $U \times U \to E$ is called **Hermitian** if $B(av, bu) = ac(b)B(v, u)$ and $B(u, v) = c(B(v, u))$ for all $u, v \in U$ and $a, b \in E$. The space of all such forms will be denoted by $Her_F(U)$, to indicate the dependence on both F and E. $GL_E(U)$ acts on $Her_F(U)$ via $g^*B(u, v) = B(g(u), g(v))$. Two Hermitian forms B, B' are called **equivalent** if there is $g \in GL_E(U)$ such that $g^*B = B'$. As in the case of quadratic forms, we denote by $rank(B) \in \mathbb{N}$ the dimension of U over E and by $det(B)$ the determinant of a matrix representing B. $det(B)$ is well defined as an element of $F^\times/N_{E/F}(E^\times)$. Let $\mathcal{HF}(E/F)$ denote the set of equivalence classes of E-Hermitian forms over F. The classification of Hermitian forms for $\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}$ is identical to that of quadratic forms: the equivalence class of an Hermitian form over $\mathbb{C}$ is completely determined by the rank and signature of B.

Over a non-Archimedean local field we have:

Theorem 6.1.6 ([Jac62, Theorem 3.1])**.** *Hermitian forms over a local non-Archimedean field of characteristic $\neq 2$ are classified up to equivalence by their rank and determinant. That is, $\mathcal{HF}(E/F) \overset{rank,det}{\to} \mathbb{N} \times F^\times/N_{E/F}(E^\times)$ is a bijection.*

If V is a vector space over F and B is a quadratic form on V let $B_{E,c}(x, y) := B_E(x, c(y))$. It is an Hermitian form on $V(E)$. This gives a map

$$(\cdot)_{E,c} : Quad(V) \to Her_F(V(E)).$$

The image consisting of forms for which $c(B(c(x), c(y))) = B(x, y)$. Conversely, it is clear that every Hermitian form for which $c(B(c(x), c(y))) = B(x, y)$ is of the form $B'_{E,c}$ for some quadratic form B'.

If U is a vector space over E we have a map $Tr_{E/F} : Her_F(U) \to Quad(U|_F)$ defined by

$$Tr_{E/F}(B)(u, v) := Tr_{E/F}(B(u, v)).$$

As in the case of Quadratic forms, this map is injective and the image consists of those B for which $B(\lambda u, v) = B(u, c(\lambda)v)$. Indeed, the injectivity of $Tr_{E/F}$ can be deduced as in the proof of Proposition 6.1.5. Moreover, if $B = Tr_{E/F}(\tilde{B})$ then clearly for each $\lambda \in E$ we have $B(\lambda u, v) = B(u, c(\lambda)v)$. Conversely, if $B(\lambda u, v) = B(u, c(\lambda)v)$ and $E = F[\sqrt{D}]$ then the form $\tilde{B}(u, v) = \frac{1}{2}(B(u, v) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{D}}B(u, \sqrt{D}v)$ is Hermitian and $Tr_{E/F}(\tilde{B}(u, v)) = B(u, v)$.

6.2. **Some Cohomology Computations.** Here we shall calculate the different cohomology sets that we need for the stability calculations.

Proposition 6.2.1. *Let G be a group and let $\theta((g, h)) = (h, g)$. Then $H^1(\theta, G \times G) = 1$.*

Proof. Elements of $Z^1(\theta, G \times G)$ are of the form (g, g^{-1}) for $g \in G$. But

$$(g, g^{-1}) = (g^{-1}, e_G)^{-1}\theta((g^{-1}, e_G)) \in B^1(\theta, G \times G).$$

■

Proposition 6.2.2. *Let G be a group, and $h \in G$ an element such that $h^2 \in Z(G)$. Then the mapping $r \mapsto rh$ gives a bijection*

$$H^1(Ad_h, G) \cong \{h' \in G : h'^2 = h^2\}/\{G - conjugacy\}.$$

The neutral element in the cohomology set corresponds under this 1-1 correspondence to the conjugacy class of h.

Proof. This mapping is clearly G-equivariant. Indeed, if r represents a cocycle then

$$\delta_g(r)h = g^{-1}r(hgh)h = g^{-1}rhg = Ad_{g^{-1}}(r)h.$$

Moreover, if $hrh^{-1} = r^{-1}$ then $(rh)^2 = rr^{-1}h^2 = h^2$ so cocycles are mapped to elements of $\{h' \in G : h'^2 = h^2\}$. This map is 1-1 and onto as it has an inverse given by $h' \mapsto h'h^{-1}$. ■

Proposition 6.2.3. *Let G be a commutative group and $\theta(x) = x^{-1}$. Then $H^1(\theta, G) \cong G/G^2$. In particular, if $A \subseteq G$ is a θ-split torus then $H^1(\theta, A) \cong A/A^2$.*

Proof. By definition, for the pair (G, H, θ) we have $S = G$ while $\delta_g(x) = g^{-2}x$, so

$$S/\delta_G \cong G/G^2.$$

■

Proposition 6.2.4. *Let $h \in GL(V)$ be an element of order 2. Then, as pointed sets,*

$$H^1(Ad_h, GL(V)) \cong (\{0, ..., dim(V)\}, dim(V_1(h))) .$$

Proof. By Proposition 6.2.2 $H^1(Ad_h, GL(V))$ is the set of linear involutions up to conjugacy. These are classified by the dimension of their 1-eigenspace. The base point of the cohomology set corresponds to h which has $dim(V_1(h))$-dimensional 1-eigenspace. ■

Proposition 6.2.5. *Let $h \in GL(V)$ be an element of order 2. Let $A = \{x \in \{0, ..., dim(V)\} : x \equiv dim(V_1(h)) \mod 2\}$. Then:*

$$H^1(Ad_h, SL(V)) \cong (A, dim(V_1(h))).$$

Proof. Consider the exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow SL(V) \longrightarrow GL(V) \longrightarrow F^\times \longrightarrow 1.$$

Clearly

$$IH^1(Ad_h, SL(V), GL(V)) \cong \{h' \in GL(V) : det(h') = det(h)\}/Ad_{GL(V)} \cong A.$$

On the other hand,

$$KH^1(Ad_h, SL(V), GL(V)) \cong F^\times/det(Z_{GL(V)}(h)).$$

By a twisting argument we see that the fiber of $h' \in \{h' \in GL(V) : det(h') = det(h)\}$ is exactly $F^\times/det(Z_{GL(V)}(h'))$. But $det(Z_{GL(V)}(h')) = F^\times$, for example as $GL(V_1(h'))$ and $GL(V_{-1}(h'))$ are subgroups of $Z_{GL(V)}(h')$ and at least one of them is $GL_k(F)$ for $k > 0$, hence has arbitrary determinants. ■

Proposition 6.2.6. *Let B be a quadratic form on a linear space V and let $h \in O(B)$ be an element f order 2. Then*

$$H^1(Ad_h, O(B)) \cong (\{B' \in \mathcal{QF}(F) : \exists C, B' \oplus C \equiv B\}, B^+)$$

Proof. As usual $H^1(Ad_h, O(B))$ can be identified with the set of conjugacy classes of elements of order 2 in $O(B)$. Every such element h' corresponds uniquely to a decomposition

$$B = B|_{V_1(h')} \oplus B|_{V_{-1}}(h').$$

By Witt Cancellation Theorem such a decomposition is determined by $B|_{V_1(h')}$. Thus, the map $[r] \mapsto B|_{V_1(rh)}$ gives the desired bijection. In particular, the base-point of $H^1(Ad_h, O(B))$ is mapped to $B|_{V_1(h)}$. ■

Proposition 6.2.7. *Let B be a Hermitian form for E/F. Let $U(B)$ be the group of unitary matrices with respect to B and $h \in U(B)$ an element of order 2. Then*

$$H^1(Ad_h, U(B)) \cong (\{B' \in \mathcal{HF}(F) : \exists C, B' \oplus C \equiv B\}, B_{V_1(h)})$$

Proof. The proof is identical to the case of quadratic forms. We have to check that the statement of Witt Cancellation Theorem holds also for Hermitian forms, but for the fields under consideration this follows directly from the classification of Hermitian forms. ■

Proposition 6.2.8. *Let ω be a symplectic form on V, and $h \in Sp(\omega)$ be a symplectic automorphism of order 2 of V. Then $H^1(Ad_h, Sp(\omega)) \cong (\{0, 2, 4, ..., dim(V)\}, dim(V_1(h))$.*

Proof. The map $H^1(Ad_h, Sp(\omega)) \to H^1(Ad_h, GL(V)) \cong \{0, 1, 2, ..., \}$ has as its image the set of symplectic h-s. If $h \in Sp(\omega)$ then $\omega|_{V_1(h)}$ is non-degenerate so $dim(V_1(h)) = 2k$. Conversely, for every $0 \leq k \leq dim(V)$ even, there is a subspace U of V of dimension k such that $\omega|_U$ is non-degenerate, and then $h' = Id_U \oplus (-Id)|_{U^\perp}$ maps to k by this map. Thus, the image of the map $H^1(Ad_h, Sp(\omega)) \to \{0, , 1, ..., dim(V)\}$ is the set of even numbers. The fiber of each such number is, by Theorem 3.2.2 applied to the action of h on symplectic forms, the set of orbits of $GL(V_1(h)) \times GL(V_{-1}(h))$ in the space of h-invariant symplectic forms on V. It is straight forward to see that there is only one such orbit, hence the proposition. ■

Proposition 6.2.9. *Let E/F be a quadratic extension. Let $c : E \to E$ denote conjugation of E over F. Then the following holds:*

$$H^1(c, GL_n(E)) = 1 \tag{7}$$

$$H^1(c, SL_n(E)) = 1 \tag{8}$$

$$H^1(c, SP_{2n}(E)) = 1 \tag{9}$$

$$H^1(c, O_E(B_E)) \cong (\{B' \in \mathcal{QF}(F) : B'_E \equiv B_E\}, B) \tag{10}$$

$$H^1(c, U(B_{E,c})) = (\{B' \in \mathcal{QF}(F) : B'_{E,c} \equiv B\}, B) \tag{11}$$

Proof. The first equatality is Theorem Hilbert's 90. All the others follow from the first and Theorem 3.2.2, by considering the action of $GL(V)$ on $E^\times$ via det and on the spaces of anti-symmetric, symmetric and Hermitian bilinear forms respectively. Note that up to equivalence there is a unique non-degerenrate anti-symmetric form. ■

6.3. **The Pair $(GL(V), GL(V_1(h)) \times GL(V_{-1}(h)), Ad_h)$.** Let V be a linear space over F and h a linear automorphism of V of order 2. Then $V = V_1(h) \oplus V_{-1}(h)$. We let $G = GL(V)$ and $\theta = Ad_h$, and then $H = GL(V_1(h)) \times GL(V_2(h))$.

The stability of this pair have been checked in [AG09, Proposition 7.7.4]. The descendants, $Z_{GL(V)}(r)$ for r symmetric, where computed as part of the proof of its stability, and they are products of the following pairs:

- $(GL(U) \times GL(U), \Delta GL(U), (x, y) \mapsto (y, x))$, one for each primary value of type A of the symmetric element r.
- $(GL(U(L)), GL(U(K)), c)$ for a quadratic extension L/K with conjugation c, one for each primary value of type B of r.
- $(GL(U), GL(U_1(h)) \times GL(U_{-1}(h)), Ad_h)$ for a vector subspace $U \subseteq V$, one for each primary value of type C.

We deduce from Theorem 5.3.6 and the stability of the pair that the pair is p-stable, s-stable and t-stable.

6.4. **The Pair $(SL(V), (GL(V_1(h)) \oplus GL(V_{-1}(h))) \cap SL(V), Ad_h)$.** Consider, in the same settings as above, the pair given by restricting Ad_h to $SL(V)$. Here $h : V \to V$ is a linear involution but we do not assume $det(h) = 1$.

We can identify the maximal (θ, F)-split tori using the following notion:

Definition 6.4.1. *Let $U \subseteq V$ be a linear subspace. We call U h-**split** if $U \cap h(U) = 0$.*

It is easy to see that a subspace $U \subseteq V$ is h-split if and only if $U \cap V_1(h) = U \cap V_{-1}(h) = 0$. To every h-split subspace $U \subseteq V$, an F-split torus $T \subseteq GL(U)$ and an h-invariant direct complement W of $U + h(U)$ we can associate a (θ, F)-split torus $A(U, T)$ as follows:

$$A(U, T, W) = \{g \in SL(V) : g|_U \in T, \quad g_{h(U)} = h(g|_U)^{-1} h^{-1}, \quad g|_W = Id_W\}.$$

Proposition 6.4.1. *Every maximal (θ, F)-split torus of $SL(V)$ is of the form $A(U,T,W)$ for a maximal h-split subspace U of V, an F-split maximal torus $T \subset SL(U)$ and some direct complement W of $U + h(U)$.*

Proof. Let A be any maximal (θ, F) split torus of $SL(V)$. Let $Y \subseteq X^*(A)(F)$ be the set of eigencharacters of A in V. Then $V = \oplus_{\xi \in Y} V_\xi(A)$ where $V_\xi(A) = \{v \in V : av = \xi(a)v \forall g \in A\}$. Since A is Ad_h-split, h maps V_ξ isomorphically onto $V_{\xi^{-1}}$. Choose a linear order of $X^*(A)$ and let Y^+ be the collection of positive characters in Y. Then $U := \oplus_{\xi \in Y^+} V_\xi(A)$ is h-split, $h(U) = \oplus_{\xi \in Y^-}(V_\xi(A))$ and $W = V_1(A)$ is a direct complement of $U + h(U)$, where 1 denotes the trivial character. Let T be the torus in $GL(U)$ generated by the restrictions of elements of A to $GL(U)$. Then $A \subseteq A(U,T,W)$. By the maximality of A we get that $A = A(U,T,W)$. ∎

6.4.1. *Stability of the Pair $(SL(V), (GL(V_1(h)) \times GL(V_{-1}(h))) \cap SL(V), Ad_h)$.* In order to decide the stability of the pair, we need to consider cocycles of Ad_h in G of the form $[r]$ for r a semi-simple symmetric element.

Lemma 6.4.2. *Let $r \in S$ be semi-simple. Then*

$$dim(V_{-1}(rh)) - dim(V_{-1}(h)) = dim(V_1(h) \cap V_{-1}(r)) - dim(V_{-1}(h) \cap V_{-1}(r)).$$

Proof. This follows from Lemma 6.1.1 by subtracting the formula for $dim(V_1(rh))$ from that of $dim(V_1(h))$. ∎

Theorem 6.4.3. *The pair $(SL(V), (GL(V_1(h)) \times GL(V_{-1}(h))) \cap SL(V), Ad_h)$ is stable if and only if there is no h-split subspace $U \subseteq V$ such that $V = U + h(U)$. If there is such a subspace then the pair is not s-stable and hence also not p-stable.*

Proof. Assume first that there exists such a subspace U. Let $T \subseteq GL(U)$ be a maximal torus, and consider the torus $A = A(U,T,\{0\}) \subseteq SL(V)$. We have $H^1(Ad_h, A) \cong A/A^2$. Since for every $a \in A$, U is ah-split, we see that $dim(V_{-1}(ha)) = dim(U) = dim(V_{-1}(h))$ so $[a] \in H^1(Ad_h, SL(V))$ is trivial. We have

$$Z_{GL(V)}(A) = T \times Ad_h(T) \cong T \times T$$

where Ad_h acts by flipping the two factors. By Theorem 6.2.1, $H^1(Ad_h, Z_{GL(V)}(A)) = 1$. Therefore, by the exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow Z_{SL(V)}(A) \longrightarrow Z_{GL(V)}(A) \longrightarrow F^\times \longrightarrow 1$$

and by Theorem 3.2.2,

$$H^1(Ad_h, Z_{SL(V)}(A)) \cong F^\times / det(Z_{GL(V)}(A,h)) = F^\times/(F^\times)^2.$$

Under the last isomorphism, an element $a \in A/A^2$ is mapped to $det(a|_U) \mod F^\times$. Indeed, the composition

$$A/A^2 \xrightarrow{\approx} H^1(Ad_h, A) \to H^1(Ad, Z_{SL(V)}(A)) \cong F^\times/(F^\times)^2$$

is defined as follows. Take an element $a \in A$, write it as $g^{-1}Ad_h(g)$ for $g \in Z_{GL(V)}(A)$ and we see that the image of a in $F^\times/(F^\times)^2$ is $det(g)$. In $Z_{GL(V)}(A)$ we have $a = g^{-1}Ad_h(g)$ for $g = a|_U^{-1} \oplus Id_{h(U)}$ and the determinant of the latter is $det(a|_U)$.

It follows that every $a \in A$ such that $det(a|_U)$ is not a square is an example of a non-trivial element in $H^1(Ad_h, Z_{SL(V)}(A))$ which is trivialized in $H^1(Ad_h, SL(V))$. By the cohomological criterion for s-stability (Theorem 5.3.1) the pair is not s-stable in this case.

Conversely, assume that no such U exists, and let $r \in S_0$ be a semi-simple symmetrization in $SL(V)$. We need to calculate $[r] \in H^1(Ad_h, Z_{SL(V)}(r))$ and show that it vanishes. Since the pair $(GL(V), GL(V_1(h)) \times GL(V_{-1}(h)), Ad_h)$ is stable, $[r]$ is trivial as an element of $H^1(Ad_h, Z_{GL(V)}(r))$, so $[r] \in KH^1(Ad_h, Z_{SL(V)}(r), Z_{GL(V)}(r))$.

It will be sufficient, though, to prove that $KH^1(Ad_h, Z_{SL(V)}(r), Z_{GL(V)}(r)) = 1$. By Theorem 3.2.2, this set is isomorphic to $F^\times/det(Z_{GL(V)}(r,h))$. Let $V = \oplus_\lambda V_\lambda(r)$. We shall construct an h-split subspace of V as follows. For each pair λ, λ^{-1} of primary values of type A, let $U_\lambda \subseteq V_\lambda + V_{\lambda^{-1}}$ be one of V_λ or $V_{\lambda^{-1}}$. For each λ of type B, let $\tau \in F1[r]$ be an element such that τ and $Ad_h(\tau)$ are linear independent over $F[r + r^{-1}]$, and let $U_\lambda = \tau(V_\lambda(r) \cap V_1(h))$. Finall1y, because $[r]$ is trivial in $H^1(Ad_h, SL(V))$ we have $dim(V_1(h) \cap V_{-1}(r)) = dim(V_{-1}(h) \cap V_{-1}(r))$ and we let $U_{-1} \subseteq V_{-1}(r)$ be any subspace of half the dimension of $V_{-1}(r)$ which is transversal to $V_1(h)$ and $V_{-1}(h)$. Let $U = \oplus_{\lambda \neq 1} U_\lambda$. It is easy to see that U is h-split. By the assumption, $V = U + h(U) + V_1(r) \neq U + h(U)$ so $V_1(r) \neq 0$. But then $Z_{GL(V_1(r))}(h) \subseteq Z_{GL(V)}(r,h)$ contains elements of any determinant, so $F^\times/det(Z_{GL(V)}(r,h)) = 1$. ■

The geometric condition of the existence of half-dimensional split subspace has a simple interpretation.

Lemma 6.4.4. *The maximal dimension of an h-split subspace of V is $min(dim(V_1(h), dim(V_{-1}(h))))$. In particular, there is an h-split subspace of V of dimension $\frac{dim(V)}{2}$ if and only if*

$$dim(V_1(h)) = dim(V_{-1}(h)).$$

Proof. Let $U \subseteq V$ be h-split. Then $U \cap V_1(h) = U \cap V_{-1}(h) = 0$ so

$$dim(U) + dim(V_1(h)) \leq dim(V)$$

and

$$dim(U) + dim(V_{-1}(h)) \leq dim(V)$$

and therefore

$$dim(U) \leq min(dim(V) - dim(V_1(h)), dim(V) - dim(V_{-1}(h))) = min(dim(V_1(h)), dim(V_{-1}(h))).$$

Conversely, let $v_1, ..., v_l$ be a basis of $V_1(h)$ and $u_1, ..., u_k$ be a basis of $V_{-1}(h)$. Then the space $span\{v_i + u_i\}_{i=1}^{min(l,k)}$ is h-split of dimension $min(dim(V_1(h)), dim(V_{-1}(h)))$. ■

Corollary 6.4.5. *The pair $(SL(V), (GL(V_1(h)) \oplus GL(V_{-1}(h))) \cap SL(V), Ad_h)$ is stable if and only if $dim(V_1(h)) \neq dim(V_{-1}(h))$. The same is true for s-stability and p-stability.*

6.5. **The Pair $(GL(V(E)), GL(V(F)), c)$.** Let E/F be a quadratic extension. Let $V(F)$ be a linear space over F and let $V(E) = V \otimes_F E$. Let c be the conjugation of E over F.

The stability of this pair is already proven.

Theorem 6.5.1 ([AG09, Proposition 2.8.5])**.** *The pair $(GL(V(E)), GL(V(F)), c)$ is stable.*

Corollary 6.5.2. *The pair $(GL(V(E)), GL(V(F)), c)$ is p-stable and s-stable.*

6.6. **The Pair $(SL(V(E)), SL(V(F)), c)$.** In order to check p-stability and s-stability of this pair, we need to identify the (θ, F) split tori.

Definition 6.6.1. *We call a linear subspace $U \subseteq V$ is called c-split if U is an E-subspace of $V(E)$ and it is c-split as an F-subspace of $V(E)$, where c is considered as an F-linear involution of $V(E)$.*

For each c-split subspace $U \subseteq V(E)$, an F-split torus $T \subseteq GL_E(U)$ and a c-invariant E-complement for $U + c(U)$, W, we can form the (θ, F)-split torus

$$A(U,T,W) = \{g \in GL(V(E)) : g|_U \in T, \quad g|_{c(U)} = c(g|_U)^{-1}, \quad g|_W = Id_W\}.$$

As in the last example, every maximal (θ, F)-split torus of $SL(V(E))$ is of the form $A(U,T,W)$. It is easy to see that

$$Z_{GL(V(E))}(A(U,T,W)) \cong Z_{GL_E(U)}(T) \times Z_{GL_E(c(U))}(c(T)) \times GL_E(W).$$

6.6.1. *Stability of the Pair* $(SL(V(E)), SL(V(F)), c)$. By Hilbert's 90 theorem, $H^1(c, SL(V(E))) = 1$. Moreover, for every (θ, F)-split torus $A \subseteq SL(V(E))$ we have $H^1(c, Z_{GL(V(E))}(A)) = H^1(c, Z_{GL(V(E))}(a))$, for every generic $a \in A$. By theorem 3.4.2 this implies that $H^1(c, Z_{GL(V(E))}(A)) = 1$. It follows from Theorem 3.2.2 and the exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow Z_{SL(V(E))}(A) \longrightarrow Z_{GL(V)}(A) \longrightarrow E^\times \longrightarrow 1$$

that

$$H^1(c, Z_{SL(V(E))(A)}) \cong (E^\times)^c / det(Z_{GL(V(F))}(A)) = F^\times / det(Z_{GL(V(F))}(A)).$$

Theorem 6.6.1. *The following conditions are equivalent:*

1 *The pair* $(SL(V(E)), SL(V(F)), c)$ *is p-stable.*
2 *The pair* $(SL(V(E)), SL(V(F)), c)$ *is s-stable.*
3 $V(E)$ *does not contain a* c*-split subspace* U *such that* $V(E) = U + c(U)$.
4 $dim(V)$ *is odd.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) follows from implication (2) in diagram 5.2.
(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Assume on the contrary that such a U exists. Let $T \subseteq GL_E(U)$ be any maximal F-split torus, and $A = A(U, T, 0)$. Then

$$Z_{GL(V(E))}(A) = Z_{GL_E(U)}(T) \times Z_{GL_E(c(U))}(c(T)).$$

It follows that

$$Z_{GL(V(F))}(A) = \{(g, c(g)) : g \in Z_{GL(V(E))}(T)\} \subseteq Z_{GL_E(U)}(T) \times Z_{GL_E(c(U))}(c(T))\}.$$

But $det(g \oplus c(g)) = N_{E/F}(det(g))$ so

$$H^1(c, Z_{SL(V(E))}(A)) \cong F^\times / N_{E/F}(E^\times) \neq 1.$$

As $H^1(c, SL(V(E))) = 1$, the pair is not s-stable by Theorem 5.3.1 (note that the cocycle we use can be chosen to come from A).

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1): If there is no such U, then a maximal (θ, F)-split torus of $SL(V(E))$ is of the form $A(U, T, W)$ for $W \neq 0$. As $det : GL(W(F)) \to F^\times$ is onto, we get that $H^1(c, Z_{SL(V(E))}(A)) = 1$ so the pair is p-stable.

(3) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4): If $dim(V(E))$ is odd, then clearly $V(E)$ is not of the form $U \oplus c(U)$. Conversely, if $dim(V(E))$ is odd, choose a basis $\{v_1, ..., v_{2n}\}$ of $V(F)$ and let $\tau \in E$ be such that $\tau = -c(\tau)$. Then $U = span\{\tau v_1 + v_{n+1}, ..., \tau v_n + v_{2n}\}$ is easily seen to be c-split. ■

We turn to investigate the stability of the pair. If $dim(V)$ is even the pair is not stable as it is not p-stable. It remains to check the case where $dim(V)$ is odd. Before we do that, we shall calculate the descendants of the pair. We do this by comparing to the descendants of $GL(V(E))$.

Proposition 6.6.2. *Let* $r \in GL(V(E))$ *be a semi-simple symmetric element. Then the descendant* $(Z_{GL(V(E))}(r), Z_{GL(V(F))}(r), c)$ *is a product of the following pairs:*

- $GL_{E[\lambda]}(V_\lambda(r)) \times GL_{E[\lambda]}(V_\lambda(r)), GL_{E[\lambda]}(V_\lambda(r)), (x, y) \mapsto (c(y), c(x))$. *one for each pair of the form* $(\lambda, c(\lambda)^{-1})$ *of primary values such that* $\lambda \neq c(\lambda)^{-1}$.
- $GL_{E[\lambda]}(V_\lambda(r)) \times GL_{F[\lambda]}(V_\lambda(r)), c)$, *one for each primary value* λ *such that* $\lambda = c(\lambda)^{-1}$.

Proof. An element of $GL(V(E))$ commutes with r if and only if it preserves the primary value decomposition. Since r is symmetric, c intertwines between $V_\lambda(r)$ and $V_{c(\lambda)^{-1}}(r)$. Thus, $Z_{GL(V(E))}(r)$ is a product of blocks as claimed. The description of each block is immediate. ■

The descendants of $SL(V(E))$ are just the intersection of the descendants of $GL(V(E))$ with $SL(V(E))$.

Proposition 6.6.3. *Suppose that $dim(V)$ is odd. Let $r \in SL(V(E))$ be a semi-simple symmetric element. Then $H^1(c, Z_{SL(V(E))}(r)) = 1$.*

Proof. We have, by Theorem 3.4.2, $H^1(c, Z_{GL(V(E))}(r)) = 1$. Consider the exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow Z_{SL(V(E))}(r) \longrightarrow Z_{GL(V(E))}(r) \longrightarrow det(Z_{GL(V(E))}(r)) \longrightarrow 1.$$

By Theorem 3.2.2 we deduce that

$$H^1(c, Z_{SL(V(E))}(r)) \cong det(Z_{GL(V(E))}(r))^c / det(Z_{GL(V(F))}(r)).$$

Let $\bar{\mathcal{A}}(r)$ denote the set of primary values of r so that $\lambda \neq c(\lambda)^{-1}$. Let $\bar{\mathcal{B}}(r)$ denote the rest of the primary values. We have, by Proposition 6.6.2, that

$$det(Z_{GL(V(E))}(r)) = \prod_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}(r) \cup \bar{\mathcal{B}}(r)} (N_{E[\lambda]/E}(E[\lambda]^\times))$$

while

$$det(Z_{GL(V(F))}(r)) = \prod_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}(r)} (N_{E[\lambda]/F}(E[\lambda]^\times)) \cdot \prod_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}(r)} (N_{F[\lambda]/F}(F[\lambda]^\times)).$$

Thus,

$$det(Z_{GL(V(E))}(r))^c / det(Z_{GL(V(F))}(r)) \cong \frac{\prod_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}(r) \cup \bar{\mathcal{B}}(r)} (N_{E[\lambda]/E}(E[\lambda]^\times)) \cap F^\times}{\prod_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}(r)} (N_{E[\lambda]/F}(E[\lambda]^\times)) \cdot \prod_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}(r)} (N_{F[\lambda]/F}(F[\lambda]^\times))}.$$

Since V is odd dimensional there must be $\lambda \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}(r)$ such that $[F[\lambda] : F]$ is odd. Let λ_0 denote this primary value, and let $d = [F[\lambda_0] : F]$. Since every d-th power in $F^\times$ is a norm from $F[\lambda]$, we deduce from the equation above that every element of $det(Z_{GL(V(E))}(r))^c / det(Z_{GL(V(F))}(r))$ is of order dividing d, and in particular this group is of odd exponent. On the other hand, we claim that this group has exponent at most 2. Indeed, let $a \in det(Z_{GL(V(E))}(r))^c / det(Z_{GL(V(F))}(r))$. Then

$$a = \prod_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}(r) \cup \bar{\mathcal{B}}(r)} (N_{E[\lambda]/E}(a_\lambda))$$

and therefore

$$a^2 = (\prod_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}(r) \cup \bar{\mathcal{B}}(r)} (N_{E[\lambda]/E}((a_\lambda))))^2 = N_{E/F}(\prod_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}(r) \cup \bar{\mathcal{B}}(r)} (N_{E[\lambda]/E}(a_\lambda))) =$$
$$= \prod_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}(r) \cup \bar{\mathcal{B}}(r)} (N_{E/F}(N_{E[\lambda]/E}(a_\lambda))) = \prod_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}(r) \cup \bar{\mathcal{B}}(r)} (N_{E[\lambda]/F}(a_\lambda))$$

and the last expression is in $\prod_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}(r)} (N_{E[\lambda]/F}(E[\lambda]^\times)) \cdot \prod_{\lambda \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}(r)} (N_{F[\lambda]/F}(F[\lambda]^\times))$. It follows that $det(Z_{GL(V(E))}(r))^c / det(Z_{GL(V(F))}(r))$ is trivial, since its exponent divides d and 2 simultaneously. ■

We deduce from Theorem 4.3.5 and Theorem 5.3.6 the following:

Theorem 6.6.4. *The pair $(SL(V(E)), SL(V(F)), c)$ is stable if and only if $dim(V)$ is odd.*

6.7. **The Pair $(GL_F(V), GL_E(V), Ad_J)$.** Let $E = F[\sqrt{a}]$, let V be a linear space over F and let $GL_F(V)$ denote the F-linear transformations of F. The subscript is used to distinguish it from linear transformations with respect to other base fields.

Let $J \in GL_F(V)$ be an element such that $J^2 = a$. Then J gives V the structure of an $F[J] \cong E$ vector space. We also have $Z_{GL_F(V)}(J) \cong GL_E(V)$. Thus we have a symmetric pair $(GL_F(V), GL_E(V), Ad_J)$.

The cohomology of the pair is computed similarly to that of inner pairs. Multiplication from the right by J gives an isomorphism between $H^1(Ad_J, GL_F(V))$ with the set of conjugacy classes of J'-s such that $J'^2 = a$.

Proposition 6.7.1. $H^1(Ad_J, GL_F(V)) = 1$.

Proof. Let $J'^2 = a$. We wish to prove that J' is conjugate with J. Over E, J' is conjugate to $diag(\sqrt{a}, -\sqrt{a}, \sqrt{a}, -\sqrt{a}, ..., \sqrt{a}, -\sqrt{a})$. In particular, J' and J are conjugate over E. By a well known result in linear algebra, this means that J' and J are conjugate over F. ■

It is not hard to identify the descendants of this pair, and the proof is identical to the one given in the case $J^2 = Id$.

Proposition 6.7.2. *The descendants of the pair $(GL_F(V), GL_E(V), Ad_J)$ are products of pairs of the form:*

- *$(G \times G, \Delta G, (x, y) \mapsto (y, x))$, one for each primary value of type A.*
- *$(GL(V(E_\lambda)), GL(V(F_\lambda)), c)$, one for each primary value of type B.*
- *$(GL_F(V), GL_E(V), Ad_J)$, one for each primary value of type C.*

Since the cohomologies of all these pairs are trivial, we deduce:

Theorem 6.7.3. *The pair $(GL_F(V), GL_E(V), Ad_J)$ is stable. In particular it is p-stable and s-stable.*

6.8. **The Pair $(SL_F(V), SL_E(V), Ad_J)$.** We consider the same pair as above, with GL replaced by SL.

Proposition 6.8.1. $H^1(Ad_J, SL_F(V)) \cong F^\times / N_{E/F}(F^\times)$

Proof. By Theorem 3.2.2 and the vanishing of $H^1(Ad_J, GL_F(V))$, we have

$$H^1(Ad_J, SL_F(V)) \cong det(GL_F(V))^J / det(GL_E(V)) = (F^\times)^J / N_{E/F}(E^\times) = F^\times / N_{E/F}(E^\times).$$

■

Theorem 6.8.2. *Let F be non-Archimedean. Then the pair $(SL_F(V), SL_E(V), Ad_J)$ is not s-stable. Thus, it is not p-stable and not stable.*

Proof. Choose a basis $\mathcal{B} = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ such that

$$Jx_i = y_i, \quad Jy_i = ax_i.$$

Then

$$A = \{g \in SL_F(V) : gx_i = \lambda_i x_i, \quad gy_i = \lambda_i^{-1} y_i, \quad \lambda_i \in F^\times\}$$

is a maximal (Ad_J, F)-split torus in $SL_F(V)$. Let T be the torus of all diagonal matrices in the basis $\mathcal{B}$. Then $Z_{SL_F(V)}(A) = T$. To compute $H^1(Ad_J, T)$, first note that since $A = T^-$ the map $H^1(Ad_J, A) \to H^1(Ad_J, T)$ induced by the inclusion is onto. Thus, the pair is not s-stable if the map $H^1(Ad_J, T) \to H^1(Ad_J, SL_F(V)) \cong F^\times / N_{E/F}(E^\times)$ has non-trivial kernel. In order to compute $H^1(Ad_J, T)$, let $\tilde{T} = Z_{GL_F(V)}(A)$. Then by the p-stability of $(GL_F(V), GL_E(V), Ad_J)$ and the vanishing of its cohomology we have

$$H^1(Ad_J, \tilde{T}) = 1.$$

We have an exact sequence of abelian $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ modules:

$$1 \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow \tilde{T} \longrightarrow F^\times \longrightarrow 1$$

and as a result we get an exact sequence

$$det(\tilde{T}^+) \longrightarrow F^\times \longrightarrow H^1(Ad_J, T) \longrightarrow 1.$$

But $det(\tilde{T}^+) = (F^\times)^2$ so

$$H^1(Ad_J, T) \cong F^\times / (F^\times)^2.$$

The induced map

$$F^\times / (F^\times)^2 \cong H^1(Ad_J, T) \to H^1(Ad_J, SL_E(V)) \cong F^\times / N_{E/F}(E^\times)$$

is the natural quotient map, which has non-trivial kernel. ■

In the real case the situation is completely different.

Theorem 6.8.3. *Let $F = \mathbb{R}$. The pair $(SL_{\mathbb{R}}(V), SL_{\mathbb{C}}(V), Ad_J)$ is stable.*

Proof. We have $H^1(Ad_J, SL_{\mathbb{R}}(V)) \cong \mathbb{R}^\times/(\mathbb{R}^\times)^2$. If r is a semi-simple symmetrization, then we have

$$H^1(Ad_J, Z_{GL_{\mathbb{R}}(V)}(r)) = 1$$

as in the proof of the stability of the pair $(GL_F(V), GL_E(V), Ad_J)$. By Theorem 3.2.2 we deduce that $H^1(Ad_J, Z_{SL_{\mathbb{R}}(V)}(r)) \cong det(Z_{GL_{\mathbb{R}}(V)}(r))/det(Z_{GL_{\mathbb{C}}}(r))$. The last group is a quotient of $\mathbb{R}^\times$ by an open subgroup, so it is either trivial or equal $\mathbb{R}^\times/(\mathbb{R}^\times)^2$. In any case, the map

$$H^1(Ad_J, Z_{SL_{\mathbb{R}}(V)}(r)) \to H^1(Ad_J, SL_{\mathbb{R}}(V))$$

is injective, since it is either a map from the trivial group or isomorphic to the identity map $\mathbb{R}^\times/(\mathbb{R}^\times)^2 \to \mathbb{R}^\times/(\mathbb{R}^\times)^2$. ■

6.9. **The Pair $(GL(V), O(B), \theta)$.** Let B be a non-degenerate quadratic form on V, and let $O(B)$ be the group of B-orthogonal transformations of V. Let $\theta(g) = (g^t)^{-1}$ where g^t is the transpose of g with respect to B.

The following result follows directly from the definition of cohomology and equivalence of quadratic forms:

Proposition 6.9.1. *$H^1(\theta, GL(V)) \cong (\mathcal{QF}_{rank(B)}(F), (V, B))$ as pointed sets. The identification is given by assigning to the cocycle $[r]$ the equivalence class of the quadratic form $B_r(u, v) := B(r(u), v)$ on V.*

The group $GL(V)$ contains maximal (θ, F)-split tori which are also maximal F-split tori. In fact, given an orthogonal basis $\mathcal{B}$ of V, the torus $A(\mathcal{B})$ of all linear automorphisms of V which are represented by diagonal matrix in the basis $\mathcal{B}$ is such a torus, and every maximal F-split torus is of this form. In particular, since $Z_{GL(V)}(A(\mathcal{B})) = A(\mathcal{B})$ we see that the pair is S-stable if and only if it is P-stable.

6.9.1. *Stability of the Pair $(GL(V), O(B), \theta)$.* To determine whether the pair is S-stable, we shall calculate the map

$$(i_A)_* : H^1(\theta, A(\mathcal{B})) \to H^1(\theta, GL(V))$$

induced by the inclusion. We use the basis $\mathcal{B}$ to represent linear maps and forms as matrices. As $\mathcal{B}$ is an orthogonal basis, $B = diag(b_1, ..., b_n)$ in this basis and therefore $B \equiv Q([b_1, ..., b_n])$. If $r = diag(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in A(\mathcal{B})$ then $B_r \equiv Q([\lambda_1 b_1, ..., \lambda_n b_n])$. Let $\phi([r]) = [B_r] \in \mathcal{QF}_{rank(B)}(F)$, a bijection by the computation of the cohomology above. We have

$$H^1(\theta, A(\mathcal{B})) \cong (F^\times/(F^\times)^2)^{dim(V)}.$$

Since $\phi(diag(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n)) = Q([\lambda_1 b_1, ..., \lambda_n b_n])$ we deduce:

$$KH^1(\theta, A(\mathcal{B}), GL(V)) \cong \{(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in (F^\times/(F^\times)^2)^{dim(V)} : Q([\lambda_1 b_1, ..., \lambda_n b_n]) \equiv Q([b_1, ..., b_n])\}$$

Theorem 6.9.2. *The pair $(GL(V), O(B), \theta)$ is S-stable if and only if there is a unique sequence $[b_1, ..., b_n]$ such that $B \equiv Q([b_1, ..., b_n])$.*

Proof. In one direction, if there is a unique such sequence $[b_1, ..., b_n]$ then $KH^1(\theta, A(\mathcal{B}), GL(V)) = 1$. Indeed, if $Q([\lambda_1 b_1, ..., \lambda_n b_n]) \equiv Q([b_1, ..., b_n])$ then by the uniqueness assumption we have $b_i \equiv \lambda_i b_i$ mod $(F^\times)^2$ so $[diag(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n)]$ is trivial in $H^1(\theta, A(\mathcal{B}))$.

On the other hand, if $B \equiv Q([b_1, ..., b_n]) \equiv Q([c_1, ..., c_n])$ for different tuples $[b_1, ..., b_n]$ and $[c_1, ..., c_n]$ then, choosing a basis $\mathcal{B}$ in which $B = diag(b_1, ..., b_n)$ the element $[diag(b_1 c_1^{-1}, ..., b_n c_n^{-1})]$ is a non-trivial element of $KH^1(\theta, A(\mathcal{B}), GL(V))$. ■

We can translate this criterion into a simple characteristic of the form B.

Proposition 6.9.3. *A quadratic form B is equivalent to $Q([b_1,...,b_n])$ for a unique sequence $[b_1,...,b_n] \in F^\times/(F^\times)^2$ if and only if $F=\mathbb{R}$ and B is definite or F is non-Archimedean and $dim(V)=1$.*

Proof. If $F=\mathbb{R}$, the only invariant of the form $Q([b_1,...,b_n])$ is the number of positive b_i-s. In particular, the only sequences of ± 1-s which are the only representatives of the form they represent are $Q([1,...,1])$ and $Q([-1,...,-1])$, which represents the classes of definite forms.

If F is non-Archimedean and $dim(V)=1$ then clearly $Q([b_1])$ is the only representative of its class, for example because of the invariance of the determinant. On the other hand if $dim(V)>1$ then $B \equiv Q([b_1,b_2,...,b_n])$. If $b_1 \neq b_2$ then $B \equiv Q([b_1,b_2,...,b_n]) \equiv Q([b_2,b_1,...,b_n])$ are two different representations, while if $b_1=b_2$ then $Q([b_1,b_2,...,b_n]) \equiv Q([b_1\lambda,b_2\lambda,...,b_n])$ for λ a non-square of valuation 0 in F, such that $\{\lambda,\lambda\}=1$. Indeed,

$$det([b_1\lambda,b_2\lambda,...,b_n]) = \lambda^2 det(B) \equiv det(B) \mod (F^\times)^2$$

and

$$H([b_1\lambda,b_2\lambda,...,b_n]) = \{\lambda,\lambda\}\{\lambda,det(B)\}^2 H(B) = \{\lambda,\lambda\}H(B) = H(B)$$

so the equivalence follows from Theorem 6.1.2. ■

Remark 6.9.1. *Note that in the cases where the pair is S-stable it is also stable for trivial reasons: if $dim(V)=1$ the pair is commutative and if B is real definite the pair is Riemannian.*

Corollary 6.9.4. *The pair $(GL(V),O(V),\theta)$ is stable, p-stable or s-stable if and only if either $F=\mathbb{R}$ and B is definite or F is non-Archimedean and $dim(V)=1$.*

6.10. **The Pair $(GL_E(V),U(B),\theta)$.** Let E/F be quadratic extension and let V be a vector space over E. Let $B: V\times V \to E$ be a Hermitian form and $U(B)$ the group of linear transformations preserving B. Let $\theta(g)$ be defined via the equation $B(u,v)=B(gu,\theta(g)v)$.

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be an orthogonal basis of V with respect to B. Let $A(\mathcal{B})$ be the torus of all invertible transformations expressed as diagonal matrices with entries on F in the basis (B). $A(\mathcal{B})$ is a maximal F-split torus of $GL_E(V)$, and it is θ-split, hence it is a maximal (θ,F)-split torus.

We have by a direct calculation that $H^1(\theta,GL_E(V))$ the the set of equivalence classes of Hermitian forms on V.

6.10.1. *Stability for the Pair $(GL_E(V),U(B),\theta)$.*

Theorem 6.10.1. *The pair $(GL_E(V),U(B),\theta)$ is s-stable if and only if $F=\mathbb{R}$ and B is definite or F is non-Archimedean and $dim(V)=1$. In these cases the pair is also p-stable and stable.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{B}$ is an orthogonal basis, and B is represented by the diagonal matrix $diag(a_1,...,a_n)$, then a cocycle $[diag(\lambda_1,...,\lambda_n)]$ in $H^1(\theta,A(\mathcal{B}))$ corresponds to the Hermitian form represented by the matrix $diag(\lambda_1 a_1,...,\lambda_n a_n)$. Thus, if $F=\mathbb{R}$ and B is represented by $diag(1,-1,...)$ then the cohomology class of $diag(-1,-1,1,...,1)$ in $H^1(\theta,A(\mathcal{B}))$ is a non-trivial element of

$$IH^1(\theta,A(\mathcal{B}),Z_{GL_E(V)}(A(\mathcal{B}))) \cap KH^1(\theta,Z_{GL_E(V)}(A(\mathcal{B})),GL_E(V))$$

so the pair is not s-stable. In the p-adic case, regardless of the form B, any cocycle of the form $diag(b,b,1,...,1)$, $b \in N_{E/F}(E^\times)\backslash(F^\times)^2$ will do, by the classification of Hermitian forms over non-Archimedean field. If B is definite or of rank 1 the pair is stable for trivial reasons: in the first case it is Riemannian and in the second it is commutative. ■

6.11. **The Pair $(O(B),O(B^+)\times O(B^-),Ad_h)$.** Let V be a finite dimensional vector space over F and B a non-degenerate quadratic form on V. Let $O(B)$ be the group of all linear transformations of V preserving B, and $h \in O(B)$ an element of order 2. Let $B^+=B|_{V_1(h)}$, $B^-=B|_{V_{-1}(h)}$, and denote $V^+=V_1(h)$ and $V^-=V_{-1}(h)$. Consider the symmetric pair $(O(B),O(B^+)\times O(B^-),Ad_h)$.

The cohomology of the pair has been determined in Proposition 6.2.6. By this computation we get:

Lemma 6.11.1. *Let $W \subseteq V$ be an h-invariant subspace of V such that $B|_W$ is non-degenerate. Then the inclusion $i : O(B|_W) \to O(B)$ given by $i(g) = g \oplus Id_{W^\perp}$ induces an injection*

$$i_* : H^1(Ad_h, O(B_W)) \to H^1(Ad_h, O(B)).$$

Proof. The cohomology of $O(B)$ is naturally identified with the set of forms $B' \leq B$ up to equivalence. The cohomology of $O(B_W)$ is naturally isomorphic to the set of forms $B' \leq B_W$, up to equivalence. It is straight-forward to check that

$$i_*(B') = B' \oplus B^+|_{W^\perp}.$$

The injectivity of i_* now follows from the Witt Cancellation Theorem. ■

The following description of the descendants of the pair is given in [AG10, Theorem 6.5.1]. We rewrite it here in a more detailed form, since we need to compute the map between cohomology sets.

Proposition 6.11.2. *Let $r \in O(B)$ be a semi-simple symmetric element of $O(B)$. Choose a collection $\mathcal{A}(r)^+ \subseteq \mathcal{A}(r)$ of primary values such that for each primary value λ of type A exactly one of λ, λ^{-1} is in $\mathcal{A}(r)^+$. Then the descendant $Z_{O(B)}(r)$ is a product of pairs:*

1. *$(GL_{F[\lambda]}(V_\lambda(r)), O(B^\lambda), \theta)$, one for each $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}(r)^+$. Here B^λ is the unique $F[\lambda]$-bilinear form on $V_\lambda(r)$ for which*
$$Tr_{F[\lambda]/F}(B^\lambda)(x, y) = B_h(x, y) := B(x, h(y)).$$
2. *$(U(B^\lambda_{F[\lambda],c}), O(B^\lambda), c)$, one for each $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}(r)$. Here B^λ is the unique $F[\lambda + \lambda^{-1}]$-quadratic form on $V_\lambda(r)$ such that $Tr_{F[\lambda+\lambda^{-1}]/F}(B^\lambda) = B|_{V_\lambda(r)}$.*
3. *$(O(B|_{V_\lambda(r)}), O(B|_{V_\lambda(r)\cap V_1(h)}) \times O(B|_{V_\lambda(r)\cap V_{-1}(h)}), Ad_h)$, one for each $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}(r)$.*

Proof. The spaces $V_\lambda(r)$ and $V_\tau(r)$ are B-orthogonal unless λ and τ^{-1} represent the same point of $spec(\bar{F})$. Indeed, we have

$$V_\lambda(r) \otimes_F \bar{F} \subseteq \oplus_{g \in Gal_{\bar{F}/F}} (V \otimes \bar{F})_{g(\lambda)}(r),$$

and similarly

$$V_\tau(r) \otimes_F \bar{F} \subseteq \oplus_{g \in \Gamma_{\bar{F}/F}} (V \otimes \bar{F})_{g(\tau)}(r),$$

so it will be sufficient to show that the direct summands are mutually orthogonal. But if we denote by $\bar{B}$ the base change of B to $\bar{F}$ we have

$$\bar{B}(u, v) = \bar{B}(ru, rv) = g(\lambda)g'(\tau)\bar{B}(u, v)$$

for every $u \in V \otimes \bar{F}_{g(\lambda)}(r)$ and $v \in V \otimes \bar{F}_{g'(\tau)}(r)$. It follows from the last equation that $v \perp u$ unless λ and τ^{-1} are conjugate,

For each primary value λ of r let $U_\lambda(r) = V_\lambda(r) + V_{\lambda^{-1}}(r)$. It follows that

$$Z_{O(B)}(r) \cong \prod_\lambda Z_{O(B|_{U_\lambda(r)})}(r|_{U_\lambda(r)})$$

where the product is arranged so that for each pair (λ, λ^{-1}) the space $U_\lambda(r)$ appears once. It is sufficient though to identify each factor in the product.

If $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}(r)$, then $U_\lambda(r) = V_\lambda(r) \oplus V_{\lambda^{-1}}(r)$. An automorphism of $U_\lambda(r)$ commutes with r if and only if it stabilizes $V_\lambda(r)$ and $V_{\lambda^{-1}(r)}$ and it is $F[\lambda]$-linear on each of them. In matrix notation with respect to some bases of $V_\lambda(r)$ and $V_{\lambda^{-1}}(r)$ the linear transformations commuting with $r|_{U_\lambda(r)}$ are of the form $\begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & Y \end{pmatrix}$. Orthogonality with respect to B then gives $Y = (X^t)^{-1}$ where transposition is taken with respect to the quadratic form B_h. Note that since $rh = hr^{-1}$ and r preserves B,

$$B_h(r(x), y) = B(r(x), h(y)) = B(x, r^{-1}h(y)) = B(x, h(r(y))) = B_h(x, ry).$$

By linearity it is true for every element of $F[r] \cong F[\lambda]$. It follows from Proposition 6.1.5 that there is an $F[\lambda]$-quadratic form B^λ on $V_\lambda(r)$ such that

$$Tr_{E/F}(B^\lambda) = B_h.$$

The uniqueness of B^λ shows that transposition with respect to B_h and B^λ agree. Finally, since

$$h\begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & (X^t)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} h^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} (X^t)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & X \end{pmatrix}$$

restriction to $V_\lambda(r)$ then gives an isomorphism between the block of $Z_{O(B)}(r)$ corresponding to $U_\lambda(r)$ and the symmetric pair

$$(GL_{F[\lambda]}(V_\lambda(r)), O(B^\lambda), \theta).$$

Next assume that $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}(r)$. Then commuting with r is equivalent to being $F[r]$-linear. By the relation $B(rx,y) = B(x,r^{-1}y) = B(x,c(r)y)$ and by the fact that r is a generator of $F[r]$ over $F[r+r^{-1}]$ we deduce that $B(\tau x,y) = B(x,c(\tau)y)$ for each $\tau \in F[r]$. In particular every element of $F[r+r^{-1}]$ is symmetric with respect to B so there is $B^\lambda \in Quad(V_\lambda(r) \cap V_1(h))$ such that $Tr_{F[r+r^{-1}]/F}(B^\lambda) = B$. The elements of $O(B^\lambda)$. Finally, since Tr is injective and

$$Tr_{F[\lambda]/F}(B^\lambda_{F[r],Ad_h}) = 2Tr_{F[r+r^{-1}]/F}(B^\lambda) = 2B,$$

we deduce that $Z_{O(B|_{V_\lambda(r)})}(r) \cong U(B^\lambda_{F[r],c})$, where $c = Ad_h$.

The case $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}(r)$ is much easier and we leave it for the reader. ■

Since $Z_{O(B)}(r)$ is a product of subgroups stabilized by Ad_h, its cohomology is a product of the corresponding cohomology sets. By the computations in Propositions 6.2.9, 6.2.6 and the well known cohomology of $\theta(g) = (g^t)^{-1}$ with coefficients in $GL(V)$ we get:

Proposition 6.11.3.

$$\begin{aligned} &H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B)}(r)) \cong \\ &\prod_{\lambda \in \mathcal{A}(r)^+} \{QF_{dim_{F[\lambda]}}(F[\lambda])\} \times \\ &\prod_{\lambda \in \mathcal{B}(r)} \{B' \in QF_{dim_{F[\lambda]}(V_\lambda(r))}(F[\lambda]) : B'_{F[\lambda],c} \equiv B^\lambda_{F[\lambda],c}\} \times \\ &\prod_{\lambda \in \mathcal{C}(r)} \{B' \in QF(F) : B' \leq B^+|_{V_\lambda(r) \cap V_1(h)}\} \end{aligned}$$

The inclusion $i_r : Z_{O(B)}(r) \to O(B)$ induces a map

$$(i_r)_* : H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B)}(r)) \to H^1(Ad_h, O(B)).$$

We shall identify $H^1(Ad_h, O(B))$ with a subset of $\mathcal{QF}(F)$ and $H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B)}(r))$ with the product above. Then we have additivity in $(i_r)_*$: If we let i_λ denote the natural inclusion of $Z_{O(B|_{U_\lambda(r)})}(r)$ into $O(B|_{U_\lambda(r)})$ then we have

$$(i_r)_*(\prod_\lambda B'^\lambda) = \oplus_\lambda (i_\lambda)_*(B'^\lambda)$$

where B'^λ is the form representing the λ-component of the cohomology class, with respect to the decomposition $H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B)}(r)) \cong \prod_\lambda H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B^\lambda)(r|_{U_\lambda}(r))})$. Thus, in order to determine $(i_r)_*$ we only need to calculate $(i_\lambda)_*$ for each primary value λ of r.

Proposition 6.11.4. *Let B'^{λ} be a quadratic form representing a class in $H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B|_{U_\lambda(r)})}(r))$. Then*

$$(i_\lambda)_*(B'^{\lambda}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}Tr_{F[\lambda]/F}(B'^{\lambda}) & \text{if } \lambda \in \mathcal{A}(r) \\ Tr_{F[r+r^{-1}]/F}(B'^{\lambda}) & \text{if } \lambda \in \mathcal{B}(r) \\ B'^{\lambda} & \text{if } \lambda \in \mathcal{C}(r) \end{cases}$$

Proof. The case $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}(r)$ is immediate: i_λ is the identity in that case.

Consider the case $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}(r)$. Let $g \in GL_{F[\lambda]}(V_\lambda(r))$ represent the cohomology class of B'^{λ} in $H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B^\lambda)}(r|_{U_\lambda(r)}))$, so that $g^t = g$ and

$$B'^{\lambda}(u,v) = B^\lambda_g(u,v) := B^\lambda(g(u),v).$$

Note that

$$i_\lambda(g) = g \oplus hg^{-1}h : V_\lambda(r) \oplus V_\lambda(r) \to V_\lambda(r) \oplus V_\lambda(r)$$

and hence $i_\lambda(g)h = gh \oplus g^{-1}h$. It follows that $V_1(i_\lambda(g)h) \cap U_\lambda(r)$ is isomorphic to $V_1(h) \cap V_\lambda(r)$ via the linear isomorphism $\phi(x) = x + gh(x)$. But then $B|_{V_1(i_\lambda(g)h)} \equiv \phi^*(B|_{V_1(i_\lambda(g)h)})$. The left hand side is the quadratic form representing $(i_\lambda)_*([g])$ and the right hand side is

$$\phi^*(B)(v,v) = B(v+gh(v), v+gh(v)) = 2B(v, gh(v)) =$$
$$= 2B_h(v, g(v)) = 2Tr_{F[\lambda]/F}(B^\lambda_g)(v,v) = 2Tr_{F[\lambda]/F}(B'^{\lambda})(v,v).$$

It follows that $(i_\lambda)_*([g])$ is represented by the quadratic form $2Tr_{F[\lambda]/F}(B'^{\lambda})$ as we had to prove.

Consider now the case $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}(r)$. Let $g \in U(B^\lambda_{F[\lambda],c})$ be a representative of a cohomology class. Then we associate with $[g]$ a quadratic form as follows: Let $g = x^{-1}c(x)$ for $x \in GL_{F[\lambda]}(V_\lambda(r))$ (There is such x by Hilbert's Theorem 90). Then the form $B'^{\lambda} := (x^{-1})^*(B_\lambda)$ is a quadratic form over $F[\lambda + \lambda^{-1}]$ for which $B'^{\lambda}_{F[\lambda],c} \equiv B^\lambda_{F[\lambda],c}$, and the equivalence class of B'^{λ} is the class of quadratic forms which corresponds to $[g]$ (note that we pull back by x^{-1} in order to get a left action on quadratic forms).

On the other hand, $i_\lambda(g)$ is the restriction of scalars of g from E to F. In order to compute the quadratic form corresponding to $i_\lambda(g)$ we need to restrict B to $V_1(gh) \cap V_\lambda(r)$. But we can identify h with c, and $g = x^{-1}c(x)$ so

$$gh(v) = x^{-1}c(x)c(v) = x^{-1}c(x(v)).$$

It follows that

$$gh(v) = v \Leftrightarrow c(x(v)) = x(v)$$

and therefore

$$V_1(gh) \cap V_\lambda(r) = x^{-1}(V_1(h) \cap V_\lambda(r)).$$

By pulling back along x^{-1} we get an equivalence

$$B|_{V_1(gh)\cap V_\lambda(r)} \equiv (x^{-1})^*(B|_{V_1(h)\cap V_\lambda(r)}) = Tr_{F[\lambda+\lambda^{-1}]/F}(B'^{\lambda}).$$

It follows that the quadratic form representing $(i_\lambda)_*([g])$ is $Tr_{F[\lambda+\lambda^{-1}]/F}(B'^{\lambda})$. ■

We turn to identify the maximal (Ad_h, F)-split tori.

Definition 6.11.1. *We call a subspace $U \subseteq V$ (h,B)-split if:*

1. $U \cap h(U) = 0$.
2. $B|_U = 0$.
3. $B|_{U+h(U)}$ *is non-degenerate.*

Definition 6.11.2. *Let U be an h-split subspace, and let T be a maximal F-split torus of $GL(U)$. Define*

$$A(U,T) = \{g \in O(B) : g|_U \in T, \quad g_{h(U)} = h((g|_U)^t)^{-1}h, \quad g|_{(U+h(U))^\perp} = Id\}.$$

Here transposition is taken with respect to the quadratic form B_h.

$A(U,T)$ is easily seen to be a (θ,F)-split torus of $O(B)$. It turn out that all maximal (Ad_h,F) split tori come from this construction.

Proposition 6.11.5. *Every maximal (Ad_h,F)-split torus in $O(B)$ is of the form $A(U,T)$ for some maximal (h,B)-split subspace $U\subseteq V$ and T as above.*

Proof. If A is a maximal (θ,F)-split torus, then let Y be the set of weights of A in V and let Y^+ be a set of positive weights and Y^- the corresponding negative weights. Then $U=\oplus_{\xi\in Y^+}V_\xi(A)$ is an h-split subspace. This was shown in the proof of Proposition 6.4.1. It remains to check that $B|_U=0$ and that B defines a non-degenerate pairing between U and $h(U)$. But it is straight-forward to check that $V_\xi(A)\perp V_\psi(A)$ unless $\xi=\psi^{-1}$, and that B defines a non-degenerate pairing between $V_\xi(A)$ and $V_{\xi^{-1}}(A)$. Thus, $B|_U=0$ and U is in perfect duality with $h(U)=\oplus_{\xi\in Y^-}V_\xi(A)$. ■

Let $A=A(U,T)$ be a maximal (Ad_h,F)-split torus and let $j_A:A\to Z_{O(B)}(A)$ and $i_A:Z_{O(B)}(A)\to O(B)$ denote the inclusions. We wish to compute $(i_A)_*$ and $(j_A)_*$. We identify cohomology classes of $O(B)$ with quadratic forms.

Let $W=(U+h(U))^\perp$. As $Z_{O(B)}(A)\cong A\times O(B|_W)$ we have

$$H^1(Ad_h,Z_{O(B)}(A))\cong(A/A^2)\times H^1(Ad_h,O(B|_W)).$$

We identify the second factor with a set of quadratic forms. Then:

Proposition 6.11.6.

$$(j_A)_*(x)=(x,B|_{W\cap V^+})$$

and

$$(i_A)_*(x,B')=2(B_{xh}|_U)\oplus B'$$

Proof. The first equation follows from the fact that the cohomology of a product is the product of cohomologies. The second follows from Proposition 6.11.4, since the quadratic form corresponding to $x\in A$ is $B_{xh}(u,v)=B(xh(u),v)$, and W consisting of only primary values of type C of all the elements of A. ■

In coordinates, if we let T be the torus of diagonal matrices in some orthogonal basis of U then $B_h\equiv Q([b_1,...,b_k])$ for some $b_i\in F^\times/(F^\times)^2$ and $x=diag(x_1,...,x_k)$. Then B_{xh} is given in this basis of U by $Q([x_1b_1,...,x_kb_k])$. Thus, we can write

$$(j_A)_*(diag(x_1,...,x_k))=(diag(x_1,...,x_k),B|_{W\cap V^+})$$
$$(i_A)_*(diag(x_1,...,x_k),B')=Q([b_1x_1,...,b_kx_k])\oplus B'$$

6.11.1. *Stability of the Pair $(O(B),O(B^+)\times O(B^-),Ad_h)$.* Let U be a maximal (h,B)-split subspace of V and let $A=A(U,T)$ for some maximal F-split torus $T\subseteq GL(U)$. Let $W=(U+h(U))^\perp$. Let k be the rank of the pair and fix a basis $v_1,...,v_k$ of U, orthogonal with respect to B_h. Let $u_1,...,u_m$ be a basis of W. Then $X=\{v_1,...,v_k,h(v_1),...,h(v_k),u_1,...,u_m\}$ is a basis of V. We shall use this basis to represent linear endomorphisms of V as matrices. We also assume that T consists of diagonal matrices with respect to $\{v_1,...,v_k\}$.

Theorem 6.11.7. *Let $F=\mathbb{R}$. The following are equivalent:*

1. *The pair $(O(B),O(B^+)\times O(B^-),Ad_h)$ is s-stable.*
2. *The pair $(O(B),O(B^+)\times O(B^-),Ad_h)$ is p-stable.*
3. *The pair $(O(B),O(B^+)\times O(B^-),Ad_h)$ is stable.*
4. *Either B^+ or B^- is definite.*

Proof. Since stability implies p-stability, which implies s-stability, it will be sufficient to prove that (1) ⇒ (4) and (4) ⇒ (3).

(1) ⇒ (4): Assume on the contrary that B^+ and B^- are both non-definite. We claim that in this case $(B_h)|_U$ in not definite. Indeed, let $u,v\in V^+$ be orthogonal vectors so that $B(u,u)=1$ and

$B(v,v) = -1$. Choose orthogonal $u', v' \in V^-$ such that $B(u',u') = 1$ and $B(v',v') = -1$. Then $B_h|_{Span\{u+v',u'+v\}}$ is not definite. Extend $Span\{u+v', u'+v\}$ to a maximal (B,h)-split subspace we see that there is a choice of U for which $(B_h)|_U$ is not definite. It can be shown that this property is independent on the choice of U but we shall just assume that we chose U to have this property, since we are free to choose any maximal (B,h)-split subspace to make the computation with.

Then, rearranging the basis of U if necessary, we have $(B_h)|_U \equiv Q([1,-1,b_3,..,b_k])$. But then

$$x = [diag(-1,-1,1,...,1)] \in KH^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B)}(A), O(B)) \cap IH^1(Ad_h, A, Z_{O(B)}(A)).$$

Indeed, by Proposition 6.11.6 we have

$$(i_A)_*([x]) = 2(B_{xh})|_U \oplus B|_{W\cap V^+}$$

but

$$B_{xh} \equiv Q([-1,1,b_3,...,b_k]) \equiv Q([1,-1,b_3,...,b_k]) = B_h$$

so

$$(i_A)_*([x]) \equiv 2(B_h)|_U \oplus B|_{W\cap V^+} = B.$$

Since x is non-trivial, the pair is not s-stable.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (3) : Assume without loss of generality that B^+ is positive definite. We should prove that the pair is stable. Let r be a semi-simple symmetrization. Let $i_r : Z_{O(B)}(r) \to O(B)$ denote the inclusion. Then by Theorem 4.3.4 we have to show that $[r]$ is trivial in $H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B)}(r))$. Let $V = \oplus_\lambda V_\lambda(r)$ be the corresponding primary decomposition of V. We have to show that $\oplus_\lambda (i_\lambda)_*(B'^\lambda) \equiv B$ where B'^λ is the quadratic form representing the cocycle $r|_{U_\lambda(r)}$. Recall that we have the forms B^λ representing the trivial cocycle of $Z_{O(B|_{U_\lambda(r)})}(r)$. If $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} - [-\infty, 0)$ then $r|_{U_\lambda}$ has a square root which is symmetric with respect to Ad_h, so it represents the trivial cocycle in $O(B|_{U_\lambda(r)})$. Thus, in this case $(i_\lambda)_*(B'^\lambda) = B|_{U_\lambda \cap V^+}$. Assume that $\lambda < 0$. Then by Proposition 6.11.4, $B'^\lambda = -B^\lambda$ so

$$(i_\lambda)_*(B'^\lambda) = -(i_\lambda)_*(B^\lambda) = -B|_{U_\lambda(r)\cap V^+}.$$

As $(i_r)_*([r])$ is trivial we have

$$(i_r)_*([r]) = \oplus_\lambda (i_\lambda)_*(B'^\lambda) \equiv B|_{V^+}.$$

It follows that $(i_\lambda)_*(B^\lambda) \leq B|_{V^+}$ so it is positive definite, but on the other hand $(i_\lambda)_*(B'^\lambda) = -(i_\lambda)_*(B^\lambda) \leq B|_{V^+}$, so it must also be positive definite. This is absurd, unless there are no $\lambda \in [-\infty, 0)$ at all. But then we already saw that $[r]$ is trivial in $H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B)}(r))$. ■

We turn to the non-Archimedean case.

Theorem 6.11.8. *Let F be non-Archimedean. The pair $(O(B), O(B^+) \times O(B^-), Ad_h)$ is s-stable if and only if it is of rank at most 1.*

Proof. Assume that the rank of the pair is at most 1. If the rank is 0 there is nothing to prove, so we may assume that the rank of the pair is exactly 1. Let $A = A(U,T)$ be a (one dimensional) maximal (Ad_h, F)-split torus of $O(B)$. Let $i_A : Z_{O(B)}(A) \to O(B)$ and $j_A : A \to Z_{O(B)}(A)$ denote the inclusions. Then by Proposition 6.11.6, $(j_A)_*$ is injective. The obstruction for s-stability is $Im((j_A)_*) \cap Ker((i_A)_*)$ which is isomorphic to $Ker((i_A)_* \circ (j_A)_*)$ since $(j_A)_*$ is injective. But

$$(i_A)_* \circ (j_A)_*(x) = 2(B_{xh})|_U \oplus B|_{W\cap V^+} \equiv xB_h|_U \oplus B|_{W\cap V^+}.$$

By the Witt Cancellation Theorem this form is equivalent to B^+ only if

$$xB_h|_U \equiv B_h|_U,$$

and since $B_h|_U$ is of rank 1 it follows that $x \in (F^\times)^2$ so it represents the trivial cocycle in $H^1(Ad_h, A)$. It follows that $Ker((i_A)_* \circ (j_A)_*)$ is trivial so the pair is s-stable.

Conversely, if $dim(U) \geq 2$ then $B_h \equiv Q([b_1, b_2, ...])$ for some $b_1, b_2 \in F^\times/(F^\times)^2$. But then if $b_1 \neq b_2$ the element $x = diag(b_1b_2, b_1b_2, 1, ..., 1)$ represents a non-trivial cocycle in $Ker((i_A)_* \circ (j_A)_*)$, since

$$(i_A)_* \circ (j_A)_*(x) = 2B_{xh}|_U \oplus B|_{W\cap V^+} =$$
$$= Q([b_2, b_1, ...]) \oplus B|_{W\cap V^+} \equiv Q([b_1, b_2, ...]) \oplus B|_{W\cap V^+} = B^+$$

If $b_1 = b_2$, choose $x = diag(a, a, 1, ..., 1)$ for $a \in F^\times - (F^\times)^2$ such that $\{a, a\} = 1$. Then by a similar computation $x \in Ker((i_A)_* \circ (j_A)_*)$. ■

In fact, most of the non-Archimedean pairs of this type are of rank ≥ 2, hence not s-stable. Recall that the rank of the pair is the dimension of a maximal (Ad_h, F)-split torus, which is the dimension of a maximal (h, B)-split subspace of V since $rank(A(U, T)) = dim(U)$.

Proposition 6.11.9. *Let r denote the rank of the pair $(O(B), O(B^+) \times O(B^-), Ad_h)$. Then*

$$r = min\{dim(V^+), dim(V^-), \mu(B)\}.$$

In particular, if F is non-Archimedean, $dim(V) \geq 7$, $dim(V^+) \geq 2$ and $dim(V^-) \geq 2$, then the pair is not s-stable.

Proof. Let $m = min\{dim(V^+), dim(V^-), \mu(B)\}$ and we prove the proposition by induction on m. If $m = 0$ it is clear. Assume that $m > 0$. We claim that in this case there is a non-trivial (h, B)-split subspace in V. Indeed, since $\mu(B) > 0$ there is $v \in V$ such that $B(v) = 0$. Let $v = v^+ \oplus v^-$ be a decomposition of v into a sum of eigen-vectors for h. If $B(v^+, v^+) \neq 0$ and $B(v^-, v^-) \neq 0$ then $U = Span\{v\}$ is (h, B)-split. If, on the other hand, one of them vanishes, say $B(v^+, v^+)$, then $\mu(B^+) \geq 1$. Thus, by Proposition 6.1.4 $\mathcal{H}_1 \leq B^+$ and therefore $Rep(B^+) = F/(F^\times)^2$. Let $u \in V^-$ be any vector such that $B(u) \neq 0$, We can choose $w \in V^+$ such that $B(w) = -B(u)$. But then the space $Span\{u + w\}$ is (h, B)-split.

Take any one-dimensional (h, B)-split subspace $U = Span\{u\}$ of V and consider the subspace $W = (U + h(U))^\perp$ of V. We claim that $r = rank(O(B|_W), O(B|_{W\cap V^+}) \times O(B|_{W\cap V^-}), Ad_h) + 1$. Indeed, the rank is the dimension of any maximal (h, B)-split subspace. Let $X \subseteq W$ be a maximal $(h, B|_W)$-split subspace. We claim that $U \oplus W$ is a maximal (h, B)-subspace, so

$$r = dim(U \oplus X) = 1 + dim(X) = 1 + rank(O(B|_W), O(B|_{W\cap V^+}) \times O(B|_{W\cap V^-}), Ad_h).$$

Indeed, $X + U$ is (h, B) split, so we have to show that it can not be extended to a larger (h, B)-split subspace. Suppose that $X + U \subset Y$ where Y is (h, B)-split, and let $y \in Y\backslash X \oplus U$ be a vector in Y such that $y \perp h(X + U)$ and $B(y, h(y)) \neq 0$. We can write $y = au + bh(u) + w$ for $a, b \in F$, $w \in W$. Then the condition $B(y, h(u)) = 0$ implies $a = 0$. Since Y is (h, B)-split,

$$B(y, u) = 0 \Rightarrow b = 0.$$

But then $y \in W$ and $Span\{y\} + X$ is an (h, B)-split subspace of W. Indeed, $B|_{X+Span\{y\}} = 0$ and $h(Span\{y\}+X)\cap(Span\{y\}+X) = \{0\}$ since $Span\{y\}+X \subseteq Y$. Also $B_h|_{X+Span\{y\}}$ is non-degenerate since it is a direct sum of $B|_X$ and $B|_{Span\{y\}}$ which are both non-degeneraate by construction. By the maximality of X we deduce that $y \in X$ so $Y = X + U$ and $X + U$ is a maximal (h, B)-split subspace of V.

We saw, though, that restricting to W decreases the rank by 1. If we can show that

$$min\{dim(W \cap V^+), dim(W \cap V^-), \mu(B|_W)\} = min\{dim(V^+), dim(V^-), \mu(B)\} - 1$$

then we are done by the inductive hypothesis. We have

$$dim(V^+) = dim(V^+ \cap (U + h(U))) + dim(V^+ \cap W) = 1 + dim(V^+ \cap W)$$
$$dim(V^-) = dim(V^- \cap (U + h(U))) + dim(V^- \cap W) = 1 + dim(V^- \cap W)$$
$$\mu(B) = \mu(B|_W \oplus B|_{U+h(U)}) = \mu(B|_W \oplus \mathcal{H}_1) = \mu(B|_W) + 1,$$

so m also decreases by 1 when restricting to W.

For the "in particular" part, since every quadratic form B of rank ≥ 5 over a non-Archimedean field represents 0, if $dim(V) \geq 7$ then $\mu(B) \geq 2$. If also $dim(V^+) \geq 2$ and $dim(V^-) \geq 2$ then $m \geq 2$ so by the inequality above $r \geq 2$ and the pair is not s-stable. ■

We next consider the p-stability of the pair in the non-Archimedean case. As p-stability implies s-stability and by Theorem 6.11.9 this happens only if the pair is of rank at most 1, the pair cannot be p-stable unless it is of rank ≤ 1. By the "in particular" part of Proposition 6.11.9 we have to check only the cases where either $min(dim(V^+), dim(V^-) \leq 1$ or $dim(V) \leq 6$. We start with the first case.

Proposition 6.11.10. *If $min\{dim(V^+), dim(V^-)\} = 1$ then $(O(B), O(B^+) \times O(B^-), Ad_h)$ is stable, and in particular it is p-stable.*

Proof. As stability implies p-stability, it is sufficient to prove the stability of the pair. Assume, without loss of generality, that $dim(V^+) = 1$. Let r be a semi-simple symmetrization. We wish to prove that $[r]$ is trivial in $H^1(\theta, Z_{O(B)}(r))$. Let $V = \oplus_\lambda V_\lambda(r)$ be a primary decomposition of V with respect to r. By Lemma 6.1.1, the condition $dim(V^+) = 1$ implies that

$$|\mathcal{A}(r) \cup \mathcal{B}(r)| \leq 2.$$

Since $|\mathcal{A}(r)|$ is always even, r can not have primary-values of type A and B simultaneously. Furthermore, since $dim(V_\lambda(r)) \geq 2$ for every $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}(r)$, we can have either one pair of primary values of type A which are in F, or a single primary value of type B in a quadratic extension of F, or only primary values of type C.

In the third case we have $Z_{O(B)}(r) = O(B|_{V_1(r)}) \times O(B|_{V_{-1}(r)})$, and r represents a cocycle which is trivial on the first factor. By Lemma 6.11.1 we see that the map $(i_r)_*$ is injective on the set of cocycles which come from the second factor. This shows that $[r]$ is trivial in $H^1(Ad_h, O(B))$.

Assume that r has a single pair of primary values of type A or a single primary value of type B. Then we have

$$V = U_\lambda(r) \oplus V_1(r) \oplus V_{-1}(r)$$

where as usual $U_\lambda(r) := V_\lambda(r) + V_{\lambda^{-1}}(r)$. Since $[r]$ is trivial in $H^1(Ad_h, GL(V))$ we have $dim(V_1(h)) = dim(V_1(rh)) = 1$. It follows that $V_1(rh) + V_1(h) \subseteq U_\lambda(r)$, since both are one dimensional and intersects $U_\lambda(r)$ non-trivially. But then $V_{-1}(r) \cap V_{-1}(h) \subseteq V_1(rh) \subseteq U_\lambda(r)$ so $V_{-1}(r) \cap V_{-1}(h) = 0$. Furthermore, $V_{-1}(r) \cap V_1(h) \subseteq V_1(h) \subseteq U_\lambda(r)$ so $V_{-1}(r) \cap V_1(h) = 0$. Since $V_{-1}(r)$ is the sum of its intersections with the eigen-spaces of h, we deduce that $V_{-1}(r) = 0$.

But then $Z_{O(B)}(r) = Z_{O(B|_{U_\lambda(r)})}(r) \times O(B|_{V_1(r)})$. In both cases the map $(i_\lambda)_*$ is injective. Indeed, if λ is of type A then $(i_\lambda)_*(B'^\lambda) = 2B'^\lambda$, and multiplication by 2 is injective on $\mathcal{QF}(F)$. A similar argument works also in the where λ is of type B. The injectivity of $(i_r)_*$ now follows from Witt Cancellation Theorem. ■

6.11.2. *Small Dimensions.* So far we investigated the stability of all Archimedean pairs of this type and all the non-Archimedean pairs except the pairs with the following dimensions of V^+ and V^-, up to symmetry:

- $dim(V_1(h)) = 4, dim(V_{-1}(h)) = 2.$
- $dim(V_1(h)) = 3, dim(V_{-1}(h)) = 3.$
- $dim(V_1(h)) = 3, dim(V_{-1}(h)) = 2.$
- $dim(V_1(h)) = 2, dim(V_{-1}(h)) = 2.$

Before we treat them one by one, we want to present some general results concerning p-stability and stability of the pair.

Proposition 6.11.11. *Let $A(U,T)$ be a maximal (Ad_h, F)-split torus of rank 1 in V. Let $W = (U + h(U))^\perp$ and $B_{hU} \equiv Q([a])$. Then the pair $(O(B), O(B^+) \times O(B^-), Ad_h)$ is p-stable if and only*

if there does not exist a scalar $\lambda \in F^\times/(F^\times)^2$ *and a form* $B' \leq B|_W$ *such that*

$$Q([2a\lambda]) \oplus B' \equiv B^+.$$

Proof. We have $Z_{O(B)}(A(U,T)) \cong A(U,T) \times O(B|_W)$, so

$$H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B)}(A(U,T))) \cong F^\times/(F^\times)^2 \times \{B' \in QF(F) : B' \leq B|_W\}.$$

By the calculation of i_* we know that, under the identification above, $i_*((\lambda, B')) = Q([2a\lambda]) \oplus B'$, and it is in the kernel of i_* if and only if $Q([2a\lambda]) \oplus B' \equiv B^+$. Thus, the result follows from the cohomological criterion for p-stability. ■

The following lemma is an immediate consequence of the classification of quadratic forms.

Lemma 6.11.12. *Let* F *be a non-Archimedean local field. Let* $B \in QF_n(F)$ *and* $C \in QF_m(F)$*, where* $m \leq n$*. Then* $C \leq B$ *if and only if there exists a form* $D \in QF_{n-m}(F)$ *such that*

$$det(D) = det(B)det(C)$$

and

$$H(D) = \{det(B), -det(C)\}H(B)H(C).$$

Proposition 6.11.13. *Let* F *be non-Archimedean. If either* $dim(V^+) = 2$ *and* $dim(V^-) = 4$ *or* $dim(V^+) = dim(V^-) = 3$*, then the pair* $(O(B), O(B^+) \times O(B^-), Ad_h)$ *is not p-stable.*

Proof. Since in this case $dim(V) = 6 \geq 5$, it follows that $\mu(B) \geq 1$. If $\mu(B) \geq 2$ then by Lemma 6.11.9 the rank of the pair is at least 2 and therefore by Proposition 6.11.8 it is not s-stable, hence not p-stable. Thus, we may assume that the pair is of rank 1. Let $A(U,T)$ be an (Ad_h, F)-split torus and $W = (U + h(U))^\perp$. Assume first that $dim(V^+) = 2$. Then, by diagonalizing B on $U + h(U)$ and then on W we can find representations $B^+ \equiv Q([a,b])$ and $B^- \equiv Q([-a,c,d,e])$. By Lemma 6.11.11, we only have to find $1 \neq \lambda \in F^\times/(F^\times)^2$ and $\tau \in Rep(Q([b,c,d,e]))$ such that $Q([\lambda a, \tau]) \equiv Q([a,b])$. Since every non-degenerate quadratic form of rank 4 represents all the non-zero quadratic residues, τ in fact can be any element of $F^\times/(F^\times)^2$. If $a \neq b$ we can choose $\lambda = ab$ and $\tau = a$, otherwise choose any $\lambda \neq 1$ with $\{\lambda, \lambda\} = 1$ and take $\tau = \lambda b$, to get a non-trivial element of the kernel.

Consider now the case $dim(V^+) = 3$. We can find representations $B^+ \equiv Q([a,b,c])$ and $B^- \equiv Q([-a,d,e])$. To prove that the pair is not p-stable, we need to find $\lambda \neq 1$ and a quadratic form of rank 2, C, such that $C \leq Q([b,c,d,e])$ and $Q([\lambda a]) \oplus C \equiv Q([a,b,c])$. Set $D = Q([b,c,d,e])$. Then by Lemma 6.11.12, $C \leq D$ if and only if there exists a form E of rank 2 such that

$$det(E) = det(D)det(C)$$

and

$$H(E) = \{-det(C), det(D)\}H(C)H(D).$$

The only pair $(H(E), det(E))$ which it is not realizable as the invariants of a rank 2 form E is $(-1,-1)$. Thus, the only form which is not $\leq D$ is $\mathcal{H}_1$, if D does not represent 0. On the other hand, $|Rep(B^+)| \geq 3$ since it is a form of rank 3. Thus, there are at least two options for C, namely $B^+ - Q([\alpha])$ and $B^+ - Q([\beta])$ where α, β are two different quadratic residues represented by B^+ which are different from a. Since one of them is different from $\mathcal{H}_1$, at least one of the pairs $(\alpha a, B^+ - Q([\alpha]))$ or $(\beta a, B^+ - Q([\alpha]))$ corresponds to a non-trivial cocycle in $KH^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B)}(A(U,T)), O(B))$, so the pair is not p-stable. ■

Next we consider the case $dim(V^+) = dim(V^-) = 2$. We consider this case first because we will use it for the analysis of the case $dim(V^+) = 2, dim(V^-) = 3$.

Proposition 6.11.14. *Assume that* $dim(V^+) = dim(V^-) = 2$*, and assume that the pair is of rank 1. Let* U *be a maximal* (Ad_h, B)*-split subspace of* V *and* $W = (U + h(U))^\perp$*. Then the pair is p-stable if and only if* F *is of odd residual characteristic and none of* B^+, B^- *or* $B|_W$ *is equivalent to* $\mathcal{H}_1$*.*

Proof. Write $B^+ = Q([a,b])$ and $B^- = Q([-a,c])$. Then by Proposition 6.11.11, the pair is stable if there are no $x, y \in F^\times/(F^\times)^2$ such that $x \neq a$, $y \in Rep(Q([b,c]))$ and $Q([a,b]) \equiv Q([x,y])$. By comparing determinants we see that that if $Q([a,b]) \equiv Q([x,y])$ then there exists z so that $x = za, y = zb$. An element $\gamma \in F^\times$ is represented by $Q([\alpha,\beta])$ if and only if $\{\gamma, -\alpha\beta\} = \{\alpha,\beta\}$. Thus, z must be a solution of the system of two linear equations over $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$:

$$\begin{cases} \{bz, -bc\} = \{b,c\} \\ \{az, -ab\} = \{a,b\} \end{cases}$$

or equivalently

$$\begin{cases} \{z, -bc\} = 1 \\ \{z, -ab\} = 1. \end{cases}$$

If F is of even residual characteristic, then $dim_{\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}}(F^\times/(F^\times)^2) \geq 3$ so since these equations are homogeneous there is a non-trivial solution, which gives a counter example for p-stability. If F is of odd residual characteristic then $dim_{\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}}(F^\times/(F^\times)^2) = 2$ so there is a non-trivial solution if and only if the equations are linearly dependent. This happens exactly when $-bc = -ab$ or $b = -c$ or $a = -b$. In the first case B^- is hyperbolic, in the second $B|_W$ is hyperbolic and in the third B^+ is hyperbolic. ■

Next we treat the only remaining case: $dim(V^+) = 2$, $dim(V^-) = 3$.

Lemma 6.11.15. *If $dim(V^-) = 3$ and $dim(V^+) = 2$ then the pair is p-stable (resp. stable) if and only if there does not exist a one dimensional subspace $W \subseteq V^-$ for which the pair $(O(B|_{W^\perp}), O(B|_{W^\perp \cap V^+}) \times O(B|_{W^\perp \cap V^-}), Ad_h)$ is not p-stable (resp. not stable).*

Proof. We prove this for stability. The case of p-stability is similar and we leave it to the reader. In one direction, assume that r is an unstable semi-simple symmetrization. Then we claim that

$$dim(V_1(r) \cap V^-) \geq 1.$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &-1 = dim(V_1(rh)) - dim(V_{-1}(rh)) = \\ &= dim(V_1(r) \cap V_1(h)) + dim(V_{-1}(r) \cap V_{-1}(h)) - dim(V_1(r) \cap V_{-1}(h)) - dim(V_{-1}(r) \cap V_1(h)) \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} &-1 = dim(V_1(h)) - dim(V_{-1}(h)) = \\ &= dim(V_1(r) \cap V_1(h)) + dim(V_{-1}(r) \cap V_1(h)) - dim(V_1(r) \cap V_{-1}(h)) - dim(V_{-1}(r) \cap V_{-1}(h)). \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting these two equations we get

$$0 = 2(dim(V_{-1}(r) \cap V_{-1}(h)) - dim(V_{-1}(r) \cap V_1(h)))$$

so $V_{-1}(r)$ intersects V^+ and V^- ins subspaces of the same dimension. But then

$$dim(V_1(r) \cap V_1(h)) - dim(V_1(r) \cap V_{-1}(h)) = -1$$

so $dim(V_1(r) \cap V_{-1}(h)) > dim(V_1(r) \cap V_1(h)) \geq 0$. Let $W \subseteq V^- \cap V_1(r)$ be a one-dimensional subspace. Then r is an unstable symmetrization in $O(B|_{W^\perp})$. It is clearly unstable, and it is a symmetrization by Lemma 6.11.1.

Conversely, suppose that there is such a line W. Then, given an element $r \in O(B|_W)$ which is unstable symmetrization, the element $r \oplus Id_W$ is an unstable symmetrization in $O(B)$. The fact that it is unstable follows from Lemma 6.11.1. ■

Proposition 6.11.16. *Assume that $dim(V^+) = 2$ and $dim(V^-) = 3$. The pair is p-stable if and only if it is of rank at most 1, F is of odd residual characteristic and none of B^+, B^- or $B|_W$ represents 0.*

Proof. The result follows directly from Proposition 6.11.15 and Proposition 6.11.14. ■

Finally, we consider the stability of the pair in the cases $(dim(V^+), dim(V^-)) = (2,2)$ or $(2,3)$.

Proposition 6.11.17. *Let $dim(V^+) = dim(V^-) = 2$ and F non-Archimedean. The pair is stable if and only if it is p-stable, F is of odd residual characteristic and neither $B^+ \equiv B^-$ nor $B^+ \equiv Q([a,c])$ and $B^- \equiv Q([a,-c])$ for some $a, c \in F$.*

Proof. We start by showing that, assuming the conditions of the proposition, the pair is stable. Let r be a semi-simple symmetrization. Let $X = \mathcal{A}(r) \cup \mathcal{B}(r) \cup \mathcal{C}(r)$ be the set of primary values of r. We shall consider all possible options for X and show that in each case either r is stable or one of the conditions listed in the proposition is violated. This will show that if all the conditions hold then the pair is stable.

We first list the options for X: since primary values of type A come in pairs,

$$|\mathcal{A}(r)| \in \{0,2,4\}.$$

Since every primary subspace of type B is even dimensional we have

$$|\mathcal{B}(r)| \in \{0,1,2\}.$$

Finally, since r is a symmetrization in $GL(V)$ we have $dim(V_{-1}(r) \cap V^+) = dim(V_{-1}(r) \cap V^-)$. Then, since the same equality holds for all primary values of type A and B we deduce from the equation $dim(V^+) = dim(V^-)$ that also $dim(V_1(r) \cap V^+) = dim(V_1(r) \cap V^-)$. We deduce that both $V_1(r)$ and $V_{-1}(r)$ are even dimensional. These facts combined show that one of the following holds:

(1) r has only primary values of type A.
(2) r has one primary value of type A and one of type B or C.
(3) $X = \{1,-1\}$.
(4) $X = \{-1\}$.
(5) $X = \{1\}$.
(6) $X = \{\lambda, 1\}$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}(r)$ coming from a quadratic extension of F.
(7) $X = \{\lambda, -1\}$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}(r)$ coming from a quadratic extension of F.
(8) $X = \{\lambda, \tau\}$ for $\lambda, \tau \in \mathcal{B}(r)$ coming from quadratic extensions of F.
(9) $X = \{\lambda\}$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}(r)$ in a degree-4 extension of F.

In case 1, since $B|_{U_\lambda(r)}$ is hyperbolic for each λ of type A, we have $\mu(B) \geq 2$ so by Proposition 6.11.9 the pair is of rank 2, contrary to the assumptions.

In case 2 let $\{\lambda, \lambda^{-1}\} = \mathcal{A}(r)$. Then $r \in A(V_\lambda(r), Z_{GL(V_\lambda(r))}(r))$, so it lies in a maximal (Ad_h, F)-split torus. As the pair is s-stable we deduce that r is stable.

Case 3 follows from Lemma 6.11.1, as well as case 6. In cases 4,5 we have $r \in Z(O(B))$ so it is clearly stable ($r = \bar{r}$ in this case).

Consider case 8. Let $F[\lambda] = E$ and $F[\tau] = K$. Then $V_\lambda(r) \cong E$ as an E-vector space and similarly $V_\tau(r) \cong K$. We have, by Proposition 6.11.3 and the fact that rank-1 Hermitian forms are classified by their determinant:

$$H^1(As_h, Z_{O(B)}(r)) \cong N_{E/F}(E^\times)/(F^\times)^2 \times N_{K/F}(K^\times)/(F^\times)^2 \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z},$$

where the second isomorphism is due to the fact that for a local field of odd residual characteristic, $|F^\times/(F^\times)^2| = 4$ while $|F^\times/N_{E/F}(E^\times)| = 2$ for every quadratic extension E/F. We have $V^+ \cong F \oplus F$ where the sum is orthogonal with respect to B. Choose a generator of each factor, and represent B^+ as $Q([a,b])$. Then the quadratic form corresponding to $[r]$ is $Q([a\alpha, b\beta])$, which must be equivalent to B^+ since r is a symmetrization. This forces $\alpha = \beta$ and in particular

$$B^+ \equiv \alpha B^+.$$

If $\alpha = \beta = 1$ then r is stable. Otherwise, since a quadratic extension is characterized by its norms into F, $E \cong K$ and $\alpha = \beta$ is the unique non-square norm from E to F. We shall treat this case. Let $x \in E$

be an element of trace 0. Then $V^- = xV^+$, and therefore $B^- \equiv N_{E/F}(x)B^+$. If $N_{E/F}(x)$ is a square in F then $B^+ \equiv B^-$. Otherwise, since there is a unique non-trivial element in $N_{E/F}(E^\times)/(F^\times)^2$, we have

$$\alpha = N_{E/F}(x).$$

But then the equations $B^+ \equiv \alpha B^+$ and $B^- \equiv N_{E/F}(x)B^+$ together give

$$B^+ \equiv \alpha B^+ \equiv N_{E/F}(x)B^+ = B^-.$$

We turn to case 7: Let $E = F[\lambda]$. We have by Proposition 6.11.3,

$$H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B)}(r)) \cong N_{E/F}(E^\times)/(F^\times)^2 \times \{C \in \mathcal{QF}(F) : C \leq B|_{V_{-1}(r)}\}\},$$

The cocycle $[r] \in H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B)}(r))$ is represented by a pair of the form $(\alpha, B|_{V_{-1}(r)\cap V|_{-1}(h)})$ where $\alpha \in N_{E/F}(E^\times)/(F^\times)^2$. The quadratic form corresponding to $[r]$ is then

$$\alpha B|_{V_\lambda(r)\cap V_1(h)} \oplus B|_{V_{-1}(r)\cap V_{-1}(h)}.$$

Let $B|_{V_\lambda(r)\cap V_1(h)} \equiv Q([a])$, $B|_{V_\lambda(r)\cap V_{-1}(h)} \equiv Q([b])$, $B|_{V_{-1}(r)\cap V_1(h)} \equiv Q([c])$ and $B|_{V_{-1}(r)\cap V_{-1}(h)} \equiv Q([d])$. Then we have $a = bN_{E/F}(x)$ for x an element of trace 0 in E. The fact that r is a symmetrization implies

$$Q([a, c]) \equiv Q([a\alpha, d]),$$

so $\alpha = cd$. If $\alpha = 1$ then $[r]$ is trivial in $H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B)}(r))$, hence stable. Thus, we may assume that α is the unique non-trivial element of $N_{E/F}(E^\times)/(F^\times)^2$. We now consider two possibilities: either $N_{E/F}(x) \in (F^\times)^2$ or $N_{E/F}(x) = \alpha$. If $N_{E/F}(x) = \alpha$ then we have

$$B^+ \equiv Q([a, c]) \equiv Q([a\alpha, d]) = Q([aN_{E/F}(x), d]) \equiv B^-.$$

If $N_{E/F}(x) \in (F^\times)^2$ then necessarily $E = F[\sqrt{-1}]$ and α can be taken to be -1. In this case we get $c = -d$ and therefore

$$B^+ \equiv Q([a, c])$$
$$B^- \equiv Q([a, -c])$$

.

Finally, we treat case 9. Let $K = F[\lambda]$ and $E = F[\lambda + \lambda^{-1}]$. Then $V^+ \cong E$ and $V^- \cong xE$ for some x of trace 0. If $N_{K/F}(x) \in (E^\times)^2$ then $B^+ \equiv B^-$. Otherwise $N_{K/E}(x)$ is the unique non-trivial element of $N_{K/E}(K^\times)/(E^\times)^2$ and thus either $[r] \in H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B)}(r)) \cong N_{K/E}(K^\times)/(E^\times)^2$ is trivial and then r is stable, or $[r]$ corresponds to $N_{K/E}(x)$ and then $B^+ \equiv B^-$.

Conversely, we have to show that if the pair is not p-stable, $B^+ \equiv B^-$, F is of even residual characteristic or $B^+ \equiv Q([a, c])$ and $B^- \equiv Q([a, -c])$, the pair is not stable.

In the first case it follows from Theorem 5.3.6.

Assume that $B^+ \equiv B^-$, Let $B^+ = B^- = Q([a, b])$. We may assume that $a \neq -b$, otherwise $\mu(B) = 2$ so by Proposition 6.11.9 the pair is of rank 2 and hence is not p-stable. Let $E = F[\sqrt{-ab}]$. Let x be the unique non-trivial quadratic residue of F which is a norm from F. Consider the Hermitian form $Q([a, b])_c(u, v) = Q([a, b])(u, c(v))$. Then $B \equiv \frac{1}{2}Tr_{E/F}(Q([a, b])_c)$. Choose $\xi \in E$ such that $\xi^{-1}c(\xi) \notin F$ and $N_{E/F}(\xi) = x$. Then $r = \xi^{-1}c(\xi)$ is unstable. Indeed, under the isomorphism $H^1(Ad_h, Z_{O(B)}(r)) \cong N_{E/F}(E^\times)/(F^\times)^2$, $[r]$ corresponds to x which is chosen to be non-trivial. On the other hand, the form corresponding to $[r]$ is $Q([xa, xb])$. If $x = ab$ then it is clear that $Q([xa, xb]) \equiv Q([a, b])$. If $x \neq ab$, then $ab = 1$ since $N_{E/F}(E^\times) = \{1, x\}$. But then $E = F[\sqrt{-1}]$ and then x is a lift from the residue field of F of a non-square. But then $\{r, r\} = 1$ so $Q([xa, ab]) \equiv Q([a, b])$ since $a = b$ and $\{x, x\} = 1$.

If $B^+ \equiv Q([a,c])$ and $B^- \equiv Q([a,-c])$ then we can get a counter example to stability as in the analysis of case 7: If $\sqrt{-1} \in F$ then the pair is of rank 2 in this case, hence not s-stable. Otherwise, we let $E = F[\sqrt{-1}]$. We can write $V = E \oplus F \oplus F$ where

$$B|_E(x) = N_{E/F}(x) = (Re(x))^2 + (Im(x))^2$$

and $B|_{F\oplus F} = Q([c,-c])$, in a basis of the form $\{(u,0),(0,v)\}$. We also choose h so that $h|_E$ is conjugation and $h|_{F\oplus F} = diag(1,-1)$. Then, let $y \in E$ be an element with non-trivial norm modulo squares in F, the element r so that $r|_E = \frac{y}{c(y)}$ and $r|_{F\oplus F} = -1$ is easily seen to be unstable.

Finally, assume that F is of residual characteristic 2. Then the pair is unstable unless B is unisotropic, by Proposition 6.11.9 and Proposition 6.11.14. But then $det(B) = 1$ so $B^+ \equiv Q([a,b])$ and $B^- \equiv Q([xa,xb])$ for some $a,b,x \in F^\times/(F^\times)^2$. Since we assume that B^+ and B^- are not equivalent we may assume that $\{x,-ab\} = -1$.

If $x = -1$ than $\mu(B) = 2$ and the pair is not p-stable. Assume that $x \neq -1$ and $\{x,-ab\} = -1$. Let $E = F[\sqrt{-x}]$ we can write B as $\frac{1}{2}Tr_{E/F}(Q([a,b])_c)$. Since

$$dim_{\mathbb{F}_2}(N_{E/F}(E^\times)/(F^\times)^2) = dim_{\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}}(F^\times/(F^\times)^2) - 1 \geq 2,$$

there is non-trivial $y \in N_{E/F}(E^\times)/(F^\times)^2$ such that $\{y,-ab\} = 1$. Let ξ be any element such that $r = \xi^{-1}c(\xi) \notin F$ and $N(\xi) = y$. Then exactly as in the case $B^+ \equiv B^-$, r is an unstable symmetrization, so the pair is unstable.

■

Thus, we finished the verification of stability for pair $(O(B), O(B^+) \times O(B^-), Ad_h)$. Let us summarize the results:

Theorem 6.11.18. *The pair $(O(B), O(B^+) \times O(B^-), Ad_h)$ is s-stable exactly in the following cases:*

- *$F = \mathbb{R}$ and either B^+ is definite or B^- is definite.*
- *F is non-Archimedean and*

$$min\{dim(V^+), dim(V^-), \mu(B)\} \leq 1.$$

Theorem 6.11.19. *The pair $(O(B), O(B^+) \times O(B^-), Ad_h)$ is p-stable exactly in the following cases:*

- *$F = \mathbb{R}$ and either B^+ is definite or B^- is definite.*
- *F is non-Archimedean and $\mu(B) = 0$.*
- *F is non-Archimedean and V^+ or V^- is one dimensional.*
- *F is non-Archimedean, $dim(V) \leq 5$, $\mu(B) = 1$, $\mu(B^+) = 0$ and $\mu(B^-) = 0$.*

Theorem 6.11.20. *The pair $(O(B), O(B^+) \times O(B^-), Ad_h)$ is stable exactly when it is p-stable and one of the following holds:*

- *$F = \mathbb{R}$ and either B^+ is definite or B^- is definite.*
- *F is non-Archimedean and V^+ or V^- is one dimensional.*
- *F is non-Archimedean of odd residual characteristic, $dim(V) \leq 5$ and (B^+, B^-) can not be represented as $(Q([\pm a, \pm b, ...]), Q([\pm a, \pm b, ...]))$ for some (not necessarily equal) signs $\pm$.*

Corollary 6.11.21. *While the stability of these pairs was known for pairs which satisfy the conditions in the first two bullets, there are examples of pairs (B^+, B^-) for which the conditions in the first two bullets does not hold but the condition in the third does. For example, every pair of forms (B^+, B^-) for which $rank(B^+) = rank(B^-) = 2$ and $det(B^+)det(B^-) \neq \pm 1$ gives a new example of a stable pair.*

We already did everything needed for this complete classification. We just make few comments. In the stability part, the conditions on the signs ensure that the rank of the pair is ≤ 1, that none of the forms is a direct factor of the other and also exclude the case $B^+ = Q([a,c])$ and $B^- = Q([a,-c])$, so it is just a way to encode these 3 conditions in one statement.

For the p-stability we excluded the condition that $B|_W$ does not represent 0, since in this case we anyway have $\mu(B) \geq 2$.

6.12. **The Pair** $(U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-), Ad_h)$**.** Let E/F be a quadratic extension with conjugation c and let V be a linear space over E. Let $B : V \times V \to E$ be a Hermitian form, and let $h \in U(B)$ be an element of order 2. Let V^+ and V^- be the eigen-spaces of h in V, and B^+, B^- be the restriction of B to V^+, V^- respectively.

The maximal (Ad_h, F)-split tori can be again described via split subspaces.

Definition 6.12.1. *An E-linear subspace $W \subseteq V$ is (B,h)-split if it is $(B|_F, h)$-split as an F-linear subspace.*

Let W be a (B,h)-split subspace of V. Let $T \subseteq GL_E(W)$ be a maximal F-split torus. Then we define

$$A(W,T) = U(B) \cap A(U|_F, T|F).$$

This is by definition the set of unitary linear transformations g such that $g|_U \in T$, $g|_{h(U)} = h(g|_U^{-1})h$ and $g|_{(U+h(U))^\perp} = Id_{(W+h(W))^\perp}$. An argument similar to the one given for $O(B)$ shows that all maximal (Ad_h, F)-split tori in $U(B)$ are of this form. Let $R = Z_{GL_E(W)}(T)$. This is a maximal E-split torus of $GL_E(V)$ and

$$Z_{U(B)}(A(W,T)) \cong A(W,R) \times U(B|_{(W+h(W))^\perp}) \cong (E^\times)^k \times U(B|_{(W+h(W))^\perp})$$

where k is the rank of the pair and Ad_h acts by $Ad_h(a_1, ..., a_k) = (c(a_1)^{-1}, ..., c(a_k)^{-1})$ on the first factor.

By Propostion 6.2.7, one can identify $H^1(Ad_h, U(B))$ with a subset of $Her(E/F)$, and we shall make this identification from now on. Let $A = A(W,T)$ be a maximal (Ad_h, F)-split torus, and i_A, j_A be the inclusions of $Z_{U(B)}$ in $U(B)$ and of A in $Z_{U(B)}(A)$ respectively. The computation of the induced mappings on cohomology is similar to the computation in 6.11. We get:

$$H^1(Ad_h, Z_{U(B)}(A)) \cong (F^\times / N_{E/F}(E^\times))^k \times \{C \in Her(E/F) : C \leq B|_{(W+h(W))^\perp}\}$$
$$H^1(Ad_h, A) \cong (F^\times/(F^\times)^2)^k$$

and under these identifications

$$(j_A)_*(a_1, ..., a_k) = ((a_1, ..., a_k), B|_{(W+h(W))^\perp \cap V^+})$$
$$(i_A)_*(x, C) = 2(B_{xh})|_W \oplus C$$

6.12.1. *Stability of the Pair $(U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-), Ad_h)$.*

Proposition 6.12.1. *Let F be non-Archimedean. The pair $(U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-), Ad_h)$ is s-stable if and only if it is of rank 1.*

Proof. Let $A(W,T) = A \subseteq U(B)$ be a maximal (Ad_h, F)-split torus. We have to compute $im((j_A)_*) \cap ker((i_A)_*)$ and check whether it is trivial. If the pair is of rank 1 then $A \cong F^\times/(F^\times)^2$ and $im((j_A)_*) \cong F^\times/N_{E/F}(E^\times)$. But then W is one dimensional and if $det((B_h)|_W) = d$ then $det(det((B_x h)|_W)) = xd$ so if $x \notin N_{E/F}(E^\times)$ then the two forms are not equivalent. But then by the Hermitian version of Witt Cancellation Theorem, $(i_A)_*([x])$ is non-trivial, so $im((j_A)_*) \cap ker((i_A)_*)$ is trivial. On the other hand, if the pair is of rank ≥ 2 then we can find a non-square $x \in T$ such that $det(x) = 1$ and then $[x]$ is a non-trivial element of $im((j_A)_*) \cap ker((i_A)_*)$. ■

As in the orthogonal case, we can easily calculate the rank of the pair.

Proposition 6.12.2. *The rank of the pair $(U(B), U(B^+)\times U(B^-), Ad_h)$ is $min\{dim(V^+), dim(V^-), \mu(B)\}$. In particular the pair is s-stable if and only if*

$$min\{dim(V^+), dim(V^-), \mu(B)\} \leq 1.$$

Proposition 6.12.3. *Let F be non-Archimedean. If the pair $(U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-), Ad_h)$ is p-stable then V^+ or V^- is one dimensional. In particular, if the pair is stable then V^+ or V^- is one dimensional.*

Proof. Assume that $dim(V^+) \geq 2$ and $dim(V^-) \geq 2$. Assume without loss of generality that $dim(V^-) \geq dim(V^+)$. Since both B^+ and B^- are of rank at least 2, we can find $v^+ \in V^+$ and $v^- \in V^-$ such that $B^+(v^+) = -B^-(v^-) = 1$, by Theorem 6.1.6. Then $W' := Span\{v^+ + v^-\}$ is easily seen to be (B, h)-split, so the pair is of rank at least one.

Let $A = A(W, T)$ be a maximal (Ad_h, F)-split torus. Then

$$H^1(Ad_h, Z_{U(B)}(A)) \cong (F^\times / N_{E/F}(E^\times))^k \times \{C \in Her(E/F) : C \leq B|_{(W+h(W))^\perp}\}$$

for $k > 0$. If $k > 1$ then the pair is not s-stable, hence also not p-stable. As B^+ is of rank at least 2, by Theorem 6.1.6 we have $B^+ \equiv Q([x])_{E,c} \oplus C$ for some Hermitian form C. As

$$dim((W + h(W))^\perp) = dim(V) - 2 \geq dim(V^+) > rank(C),$$

we have $C \leq B|_{(W+h(W))^\perp}$. It follows that (x, C) represents a non-trivial element of $ker((i_A)_*)$. ■

In fact, this completes the stability verification in the non-Archimedean case, due to the following theorem of Aizenbud, Gourevitch, Rallis, Schiffmann, Sun and Zhu:

Theorem 6.12.4 ([AGRS10, §5] and [SZ12, §7])**.** *If V^+ or V^- is one dimensional, the pair $(U(B), U(B^+)\times U(B^-), Ad_h)$ is stable.*

We turn to the Archimedean case.

Proposition 6.12.5. *Let $F = \mathbb{R}$. The following are equivalent:*

- *The pair $(U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-), Ad_h)$ is s-stable.*
- *The pair $(U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-), Ad_h)$ is p-stable.*
- *The pair $(U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-), Ad_h)$ is stable.*
- *Either B^+ or B^- is definite.*

The proof is identical to the proof of Proposition 6.11.7. Just note that in the case of a primary value in $\mathbb{R}$ the image of $[r_\lambda]$ is $\text{sign}(\lambda)B_h|_{V_\lambda(r)}$, exactly like in the case of $O(B)$.

We conclude:

Theorem 6.12.6. *The pair $(U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-), Ad_h)$ is s-stable exactly in the following cases:*

- *$F = \mathbb{R}$ and either B^+ or B^- is definite.*
- *F is non-Archimedean and the pair if of rank at most 1.*

Theorem 6.12.7. *The pair $(U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-), Ad_h)$ is p-stable if and only if it is stable. This is the case exactly when one of the following holds:*

- *$F = \mathbb{R}$ and either B^+ or B^- is definite.*
- *F is non-Archimedean and either B^+ or B^- is one-dimensional.*

6.13. **Summary.** The following table summarizes the computations carried in this section. In the columns stable (resp. P-st., S-st.) we list necessary and sufficient conditions for stability (resp. p-stability, s-stability.). The columns labeled $\mathbb{R}$ are for the real pairs while the columns labeled "non-Archomedean" are for the non-Archimedean pairs. The entries (A), (B), (C) and (D) described below the table due to their length.

	$\mathbb{R}$			non-Archimedean		
Pair	Stable	S-st.	P-st.	Stable	S-st.	P-st.
$GL(V), GL(V^+) \times GL(V^-)$	Always					
$SL(V), (GL(V^+) \times GL(V^-)) \cap SL(V)$	$dim(V^+) \neq dim(V^-)$					
$GL_F(V), GL_E(V)$	Always					
$SL_F(V), SL_E(V)$	Always			dim V = 1		
$GL(V(E)), GL(V(F))$	Always					
$SL(V(E)), SL(V(F))$	dim(V)=2k+1					
$O(B), O(B^+) \times O(B^-)$	B^+ or B^- is definite			(A)	(B)	(C)
$U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-)$	B^+ or B^- is definite			(D)	(C)	(D)
$GL(V), O(B)$	B is definite			dim(V)=1		
$GL(V), U(B)$	B is definite			dim(V)=1		

Recall that $\mu(B)$ is the maximal dimension of a subspace on which B vanishes, and that $Q([a_1, ..., a_k])$ is the quadratic form with diagonal entries a_i.

(A) : At least one of the following holds:

- $dim(V^+) = 1$ or $dim(V^-) = 1$.
- F is of odd residual characteristic, $dim(V) \leq 5$, $\mu(B) \leq 1$, $\mu(B^+) = \mu(B^-) = 0$ and (B^+, B^-) can not be represented as $(Q([a, b, ...]), Q([\epsilon_1 a, \epsilon_2 b, ...]))$ for $\epsilon_i \in \{\pm 1\}$.

(B) : At least one of the following holds:

- $dim(V^+) = 1$ or $dim(V^-) = 1$.
- F is of odd residual characteristic, $dim(V) \leq 5$, $\mu(B) \leq 1$ and $\mu(B^+) = \mu(B^-) = 0$.
- $\mu(B) = 0$.

(C) : $min\{dim(V^+), dim(V^-), \mu(B)\} \leq 1$.

(D) : $min\{dim(V^+), dim(V^-)\} \leq 1$.

7. Applications to Representation Theory

In this section we link our geometric results to the representation theory of the symmetric pair.

7.1. **p-stability and Multiplicity One for Principal Series Representations.** Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric non-Archimedean pair which is not p-stable. In this case, generically, one can associate a functional on the generalized principal series representation of G to each open orbit of H in G/P, where P is a θ-split parabolic subgroup of G. In particular, a generic generalized principal series has multiplicity more than 1. This result is due to Blanck and Delorme in the non-Archimedean case and to van den Ban in the real case for unitary principal series, and we shall quote these just after specifying some terminology. From now on, when talking about induced representations, we consider only representation induced from unramified characters of a parabolic subgroup in the non-Archimedean case and to representations induced from unitary characters of parabolic subgroups in the real case.

For a parabolic subgroup $P \subseteq G$, a Levi subgroup $M \subseteq P$ and a character $\psi : M \to \mathbb{C}$ we let $I_P(\psi)$ denote the normalized parabolic induction of ψ to G. Let P be a θ-split parabolic subgroup, and A a maximal (θ, F)-split torus in P. Let $M = Z_G(A) = P \cap \theta(P)$, and let X be the variety of complex unramified characters of M which are defined over F and preserved by σ. Since there is a homomorphism $A \to M/[M, M]$ with finite kernel and cokernel, X can be identified with the space of complex unramified characters of A.

Let $J_P(\psi)$ be the H sub-representation of $Res^G_H I_P(\psi)$ corresponding to the open orbits of H in G/P in the natural filtration of $Res^G_H I_P(\psi)$.

Theorem 7.1.1. *Let F be non-Archimedean. For ψ outside of a union of complex hypersurfaces in X, there is an isomorphism $Hom_H(I_P(\psi),\mathbb{C}) \cong Hom_H(J_P(\psi),\mathbb{C})$.*

This follows from the main theorem of [HW93], by dropping the unnecessary simplifying assumption of single open orbit.

Lemma 7.1.2. *For ψ outside a union of complex hypersurfaces, we have $dim(Hom_H(I_P(\psi),\mathbb{C}))$ is the number of open H-orbits in G/P. In the real case, by complex hypersurface in X we mean an intersection of such hypersurface with the real subspace of unitary characters. Such intersection is easily seen to be a proper subspace of the space of unitary characters.*

Proof. In the real case it follows directly from [vdB88, Theorem 5.10] and [vdB88, Corollary 5.11 (ii)] by substituting $\xi = 1$, in the notation of Van Den Ban.

We consider the non-Archimedean case, which, using the result of Blanck and Delorme above, goes along the same lines of the proof of the real case.

Assume on the contrary that (G,H,θ) is not p-stable. It will be sufficient to prove that, in the settings of 7.1.1, $dim(Hom_H(J_P(\psi),\mathbb{C})) > 1$. Indeed, the representation $I_P(\psi)$ is irreducible for a generic ψ ([]), $I_P(\psi)$ serves as a counter example to the Gelfand property for ψ outside some non-trivial Zariski-closed subset of $X^*(A)$. In fact, we can prove that outside a proper Zariski-closed subset, $dim(Hom_H(J_P(\psi),\mathbb{C}))$ is exactly the number of open orbits of H in G/P. Let $J_O(\psi)$ be the sub-space of $J_P(\psi)$ of functions supported on $\pi^{-1}(O)$, where O is an open orbit of H in G/P and $\pi : G \to G/P$ is the natural projection. Then,

$$J_P(\psi) \cong \oplus_{O\text{open orbit}} J_O(\psi)$$

so it will be sufficient to prove that $Hom_H(J_O(\psi),\mathbb{C})$ is one-dimensional. By Frobenius reciprocity, if $x_0 \in O$, then

$$Hom_H(J_O(\psi),\mathbb{C}) \cong Hom_{Stb_H(x_0)}(\psi \otimes (\Delta_{O,x_0})^*,\mathbb{C}),$$

where Δ_{O,x_0} is the fiber of the sheaf of densities on O. We claim that Δ_{O,x_0} is trivial as a representation of $Stab_H(x_0)$.

Indeed, as $Stab_H(x_0) = H \cap P'$ where P' is some θ-split parabolic subgroup, we have

$$Stab_H(x_0) = H \cap P' = H \cap P' \cap \theta(P') = H \cap Z_G(A') = (Z_G(A'))^\theta.$$

As $Z_G(A')$ is reductive, and the fixed points subgroup of an involution is always reductive, $Stab_H(x_0)$ is reductive. It follows that the modular character of $Stab_H(x_0)$ is trivial, as for H. Thus, as Δ_{O,x_0} is the quotient of these, it is trivial.

Finally, because $\psi \in X$, it is trivial on H. It follows that

$$Hom_H(J_O(\psi),\mathbb{C}) \cong Hom_{Stb_H(x_0)}(\psi \otimes (\Delta_{O,x_0})^*,\mathbb{C}) \cong Hom_{Stb_H(x_0)}(\mathbb{C},\mathbb{C}) \cong \mathbb{C}.$$

■

Theorem 7.1.3. *Let (G,H,θ) be a symmetric pair. If (G,H) is a Gelfand pair, then (G,H,θ) is P-stable.*

Proof. We prove the contra-positive. Since for ψ outside a union of finitely many complex hypersurfaces the representation $I_P(\psi)$ has two independent H-invariant functionals, it will be sufficient to prove that we can choose ψ so that $I_P(\psi)$ is irreducible outside this union of complex hyperplanes. In the real case the irreducibility follows from [vdB88, Proposition 3.7]. Since the proof uses only unitarity and the filtration of $r_P(I_P(\psi))$ where r_P is the Jaquet functor, the same proof works for the non-Archimedean case. ■

7.2. **Stability and the Gelfand Property.** Throughout this section we assume that $F \neq \mathbb{C}$. In the case $F = \mathbb{C}$ stability holds for every connected pair so it is irrelevant for the verification of the Gelfand property.

As we already mentioned, for many pairs the stability is proved to imply the Gelfand property. A list of such pairs can be found in [AG10, Aiz13]. Since we proved stability for many pairs, we get as a result several new Gelfand pairs.

First, let us present without proofs the main factors in the method used to show for a given pair that stable $\Rightarrow$ Gelfand. Let X be the F-points of an affine algebraic variety over F. Then $S^*(X)$ denote the space of Schwartz distributions on X. If G acts on X, we denote by X/G the set $\mathbf{X}(F)/\mathbf{G}(F)$.

Definition 7.2.1. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair. An element $g \in G$ is called admissible if Ad_g commutes with θ and $Ad_g|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ stabilize all the closed H-orbits in $\mathfrak{s}$.*

Recall that $\mathfrak{s}$ is the space of symmetric elements in the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$.

Let $\mathbf{K}$ be a reductive group defined over F and let (π, V) be a finite dimensional algebraic representation of $K = \mathbf{K}(F)$. Then we let $Q(V)$ be the direct complement of V^K, $\Gamma(V) \subseteq Q(V)$ the set of elements $v \in V$ such that $0 \in \overline{\pi(G)v}$ and $R(V) = Q(V) - \Gamma(V)$.

Definition 7.2.2. *A symmetric pair (G, H, θ) is called **regular** if for every admissible $g \in G$ for which*

$$S^*(R(\mathfrak{s}))^{H\times H} \subseteq S^*(R(\mathfrak{s}))^{Ad_g}$$

we have

$$S^*(Q(\mathfrak{s}))^{H\times H} \subseteq S^*(Q(\mathfrak{s}))^{Ad_g}$$

Definition 7.2.3. *A pair (G, H) is **GP2** if for every irreducible admissible representation π of G, we have*

$$dim(Hom_H(\pi, \mathbb{C})) \cdot Hom_H(\tilde{\pi}, \mathbb{C}) \leq 1.$$

Theorem 7.2.1 ([AG09, Theorem 7.4.5])**.** *Let (G, H, θ) be a stable symmetric pairs such that all its descendants are regular. Then (G, H, θ) is GP2.*

With just a little more one can actually deduce the Gelfand property from stability and the regularity of the descendants of the pair.

Theorem 7.2.2 ([AG09, Corollary 8.2.3])**.** *If (G, H) is GP2 and there is an Ad_G-tame anti involution $\tau : G \to G$ with $\tau(H) = H$ then the pair (G, H) is a Gelfand pair.*

Corollary 7.2.3. *Let (G, H, θ) be a symmetric pair. If (G, H, θ) is good, all its descendants are regular, and there is an Ad_G-tame anti-involution $\tau : G \to G$ with $\tau(H) = H$, then the pair (G, H) is a Gelfand pair.*

This method applies to the pair $(GL(V), GL(V^+) \oplus GL(V^-), Ad_h)$ as by [AG09, §7.7.2] all the descendants of the pair are regular, and we can choose $\tau(x) = x^t$. We will show how to use this result to deduce the same for the pair $(SL(V), GL(V^+) \times GL(V^-) \cap SL(V), Ad_h)$.

Theorem 7.2.4. *All the descendants of the pair $(SL(V), GL(V^+) \times GL(V^-) \cap SL(V), Ad_h)$ are regular.*

Proof. Let $K = Z_{SL(V)}(r)$ be a descendant, and $\mathfrak{k}$ its Lie algebra. Then

$$K = Z_{GL(V)}(r) \cap SL(V).$$

Let $g \in K$ be admissible. We claim that it is automatically admissible as an element of $Z_{GL(V)}(r)$. Indeed, it is true in general that the closed orbits of G on $Lie(G)^\sigma$ are the same as these of Ad_G. Since

$$Ad_{Z_{SL(V)}(r)} \cong Ad_{Z_{GL(V)}(r)}$$

while

$$Lie(K)^\sigma \cong Lie(Z_{GL(V)}(r))^\sigma$$

since symmetric elements are automatically of trace 0, the criterion for admissibility is the same for K and for $Z_{GL(V)}(r)$. As the action of G on its Lie algebra factors through Ad_G and the symmetric part of the Lie algebra of K and $Z_{GL(V)}(r)$ is the same, the condition

$$S^*(R(\mathfrak{k}^\sigma))^{H\cap K} \subseteq S^*(R(\mathfrak{k}^\sigma))^{Ad_g}$$

is equivalent to

$$S^*(R(Z_{\mathfrak{gl}(V)}(r)^\sigma))^{Z_{GL(V)}(r)\cap Z_{GL(V)}(h)} \subseteq S^*(R(Z_{\mathfrak{gl}(V)}(r)^\sigma))^{Ad_g}$$

and similarly with R replaced by Q. Thus, the regularity of $(GL(V), GL(V^+)\oplus GL(V^-), Ad_h)$ implies the regularity of $(SL(V), GL(V^+)\times GL(V^-)\cap SL(V), Ad_h)$. ■

As a consequence of the last theorem and the computation carried in section 6, we get:

Theorem 7.2.5. *The pair $(SL(V), (GL(V^+)\times GL(V^-)\cap SL(V)), Ad_h)$ is a Gelfand pair if and only if $dim(V^+) \neq dim(V^-)$.*

Proof. If $dim(V^+) \neq dim(V^-)$ then the pair is stable and all its descendants are regular, so it is a Gelfand pair. If $dim(V^+) = dim(V^-)$ the pair is not p-stable, hence by Theorem 7.1.3 it is not a Gelfand pair. By Corollary 7.2.3, it is left to find an admissible $\tau : G \to G$ stabilizing H. We can choose $\tau(x) = x^t$, in some basis in which h is diagonal. Then τ is admissible since $\tau^2 = Id$ and every diagonalizible matrix in $SL_n(F)$ is $\mathrm{SL}_n(F)$-conjugate to its transposed matrix, and it preserves H since h is diagonal with entries ± 1. ■

Theorem 7.2.6. *Let $B = B^+\oplus B^-$ be a non-degenerate quadratic form over $\mathbb{R}$. The pair $(O(B), O(B^+)\times O(B^-))$ is a Gelfand pair if and only if either B^+ or B^- is definite.*

Proof. Let $\tau : O(B) \to O(B)$ be the involution $\tau(x) = x^{-1}$. Then τ is tame. Indeed, let $x \in O(B)$ be semi-simple. Let $V = \oplus_\lambda V_\lambda(x)$ be a primary decomposition of V. Let $U_\lambda = V_\lambda(x) + V_{\lambda^{-1}}(x)$. Then the U_λ-s are mutually orthogonal and span V. Let $\lambda \in spec(F[x])$ be a primary value of x. If $\lambda \neq \lambda^{-1}$, then any orthogonal involution that intertwine $V_\lambda(x)$ and $V_{\lambda^{-1}}(x)$ conjugates $x|_{U_\lambda}$ to its inverse. If $\lambda = \lambda^{-1}$, then the unique non-trivial element of $Gal_{F[\lambda]/F[\lambda+\lambda^{-1}]}$ conjugates $x|_{U_\lambda}$ to its inverse, and it represents an orthogonal F-automorphism of U_λ. In any case, $x|_{U_\lambda}$ is conjugate to its inverse, hence x and x^{-1} are conjugate.

Since $\tau(H) = H$, by Corollary 7.2.3, the pair is a Gelfand pair if it is stable and all its descendants are regular.

Since by [AG10, Theorem 3.0.5] all the descendants of this pair are regular, it is a Gelfand pair if it is stable, so one direction follows from Theorem 6.11.20. For the other direction, if neither B^+ nor B^- is definite, then the pair is not p-stable by Theorem 6.11.19, and thus by Theorem 7.1.3 the pair is not a Gelfand pair. ■

Similarly, we get:

Theorem 7.2.7. *$B = B^+ \oplus B^-$ be a non-degenerate quadratic form over non-Archimedean local field F of characteristic 0. The pair $(O(B), O(B^+)\times O(B^-))$ is a Gelfand pair in the following situation:*

- *$rank(B^+) = 1$ or $rank(B^-) = 1$.*
- *if $rank(B) \leq 5$, $\mu(B) \leq 1$, $\mu(B^+) = \mu(B^-) = 0$, F is of odd residual characteristic and there is no representation of (B^+, B^-) as $(Q([a, b, ...]), Q([\epsilon_1 a, \epsilon_1 b, ...]))$ for some $\epsilon_i \in \{\pm 1\}$.*

Moreover, if $rank(B^+) > 1$ and $rank(B^-) > 1$ and either F is of even residual characteristic or $\mu(B^+) > 0$ or $\mu(B^-) > 0$ or $rank(B) \geq 6$ the pair is not a Gelfand pair.

There are still few interesting cases where this pair is not stable but is p-stable. They probably have to be treated using other methods.

Theorem 7.2.8. *Let $B = B^+ \oplus B^-$ be a Hermitian form over $\mathbb{C}$. The pair $(U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-))$ is a Gelfand pair if and only if B^+ or B^- is definite.*

Proof. Let $\tau(x) = \bar{x}^{-1}$. By an argument similar to the one given for $(O(B), O(B^+) \times O(B^-))$, this anti-involution is $Ad_{U(B)}$-tame. Since it stabilizes $U(B^+) \times U(B^-)$, we deduce from Corollary 7.2.3 that the pair is a Gelfand pair if it is stable and all of its descendants are regular. By [AG10, Theorem 3.0.7] all the descendants of this pair are regular. Since by Theorem 6.12.7 this pair is stable exactly when B^+ or B^- is definite we see that the pair is a Gelfand pair in this case. Conversely, by the same theorem if none of (B^+, B^-) is definite then te pair is not p-stable, hence it not a Gelfand pair. ■

Similarly, we get

Theorem 7.2.9. *Let $B = B^+ \oplus B^-$ be a Hermitian form for a quadratic extension E/F of non-Archimedean local fields of characteristic 0. The pair $(U(B), U(B^+) \times U(B^-))$ is a Gelfand pair if and only if B^+ or B^- is of rank 1.*

Note that, since the Gelfand property for pairs where $rank(B^+) = 1$ is already proven in [AGRS10] the last theorem should be considered as a negative result.

Proof. Similarly to the Archimedean case, we deduce that the pair is a Gelfand pair if it is stable and all its descendants are regular. By [AG10, Theorem 3.0.7] all the descendants of this pair are regular. Since by Theorem 6.12.7 this pair is stable exactly when B^+ or B^- is definite we see that the pair is a Gelfand pair in this case. Conversely, by the same theorem if none of (B^+, B^-) is definite then the pair is not p-stable, hence it not a Gelfand pair. ■

Theorem 7.2.10. *Let E/F be a quadratic extension of local fields of characteristic 0. The pair $(SL_n(E), SL_n(F))$ is a Gelfand pair if and only if n is odd.*

Proof. If n is even then by Theorem 6.6.1 the pair is not p-stable, hence not a Gelfand pair. Assume that n is odd. Since the anti-involution $\tau(x) = x^t$ is $Ad_{SL_n(E)}$-tame and stabilizes $SL_n(F)$, this pair is a Gelfand pair if it is stable and has regular descendants. By [AG09, Theorem 7.6.2] along with [AG09, Remark 7.3.2], if the pair is stable then it is a Gelfand pair. But this pair is stable if n is odd by Theorem 6.6.4. ■

We turn to prove the Gelfand property for the pairs $(GL_F(V), GL_E(V), Ad_J)$ and $(SL_F(V), SL_E(V), Ad_J)$ in the cases where they are stable.

Proposition 7.2.11. *All the descendants of the pairs $(GL_F(V), GL_E(V), Ad_J)$ and $(SL_F(V), SL_E(V), Ad_J)$ are regular. In particular, if a pair of one of these types is stable then it is a Gelfand pair.*

Proof. We prove for $(GL_F(V), GL_E(V), Ad_J)$, the case $(SL_F(V), SL_E(V), Ad_J)$ is similar. Let (G, H, θ) be a pair of this type, and let $K \subseteq G$ be a descendent. We wish to prove that it is regular. If every admissible element of K lies in H then it is regular for trivial reasons. As a consequence of [AG09, Proposition 7.3.7] and the implication "special" $\Rightarrow$ "regular" in the diagram in appendix E of the same paper, the descendent is regular also if for every $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple (X, Y, Z) such that $X \in \mathfrak{k}^\sigma$ and $Y \in \mathfrak{k}^\theta$, we have $Tr(ad(Y)|_{Z_{\mathfrak{h}}(X)}) \neq dim(Q(\mathfrak{k}^\sigma))$ and F is non-Archimedean or $Tr(ad(Y)|_{Z_{\mathfrak{h}}(X)}) < dim(Q(\mathfrak{k}^\sigma))$ and $F = \mathbb{R}$. Thus, it is sufficient to prove that one of the possibilities holds for $(K, K \cap H, \theta)$.

Note that the above statement is true for the pairs of type $(GL(V), GL(V^+) \times GL(V^-), Ad_h)$, a fact which is proven, even though it is not stated in this way, in [AG09, §7.7.2]. But $(\mathbf{G}(E), \mathbf{H}(E), \theta(E))$ is a pair of type $(GL(V), GL(V^+) \times GL(V^-), Ad_h)$ so every descendent of it satisfies one of the two required properties. In particular either $(\mathbf{K}(E), \mathbf{K}(E) \cap \mathbf{H}(E), \theta(E))$ has no admissible elements out of $\mathbf{H}(E)$ or every Y in a suitable $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple satisfies the requirement above on the trace.

In the first case, K has no admissible elements out of H since otherwise the same element will be a non-trivial admissible in $\mathbf{K}(E)$. In the second case, if Y is the middle element in an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple with

the above properties in $\mathfrak{k}$, let Y_E denote the corresponding element of $\mathfrak{k} \otimes_F E$. Then

$$Tr(ad(Y_E)|_{Z_{\mathfrak{h}}(X)\otimes_F E}) = Tr(ad(Y)|_{Z_{\mathfrak{h}}(X)}$$

since Tr is stable under base-change. Moreover,

$$dim(Q(\mathfrak{k}^\sigma)) = dim(Q((\mathfrak{k} \otimes_F E)^\sigma))$$

since dimension is stable under base-change.

As Y_E is the middle of an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ triple in $\mathfrak{k} \otimes_F E$, (X_E, Y_E, Z_E), satisfying the conditions that $Y_E \in (\mathfrak{k} \otimes_F E)^\theta$ and $X_E \in \mathfrak{k} \otimes_F E)^\sigma$,

$$Tr(ad(Y)|_{Z_{\mathfrak{h}}(X)}) = Tr(ad(Y_E)_{Z_{\mathfrak{h}}(X)\otimes_F E}) \neq dim(Q((\mathfrak{k} \otimes_F E)^\sigma)) = dim(Q(\mathfrak{k}^\sigma))$$

in the non-Archimedean case or

$$Tr(ad(Y)|_{Z_{\mathfrak{h}}(X)}) = Tr(ad(Y_E)_{Z_{\mathfrak{h}}(X)\otimes_F E}) < dim(Q((\mathfrak{k} \otimes_F E)^\sigma)) = dim(Q(\mathfrak{k}^\sigma))$$

in the real case. This proves the regularity of the pair $(K, K \cap H, \theta)$. ■

Remark 7.2.1. *Informally, we can explain the above result as follows. As all the ingredients in the method used to prove the regularity of many pairs are stable under base-change, in many cases regularity of a pair after base-change implies its regularity.*

As a result, and using the decision of the stability and p-stability of these pairs in Theorems 6.7.3 and 6.8.3, we get:

Theorem 7.2.12. *The pair $(GL_F(V), GL_E(V), Ad_J)$ is a Gelfand pair.*

Proof. In view of Corollary 7.2.3, we only have to find a tame anti-involution for this pair. By choosing J to be orthogonal, we can choose $\tau(x) = x^t$. ■ ■

Similarly, we get:

Theorem 7.2.13. *The pair $(SL_F(V), SL_E(V), Ad_J)$ is a Gelfand pair if and only if $dim(V) = 1$ or F is Archimedean.*

References

[Ad00] J. Adams, *Galois Cohomology of Real Groups*, (2000). arXiv:1310.7917[math.GR].

[Aiz13] A. Aizenbud: *A partial analog of integrability theorem for distributions on p-adic spaces and applications,* Israel Journal of Mathematics, Vol. 193, Pages 233-262, Issue 1, (2013). See also arXiv:0811.2768[math.RT].

[AG09] A. Aizenbud, D. Gourevitch, *Generalized Harish-Chandra Descent, Gelfand Pairs, And an Archimedean Analog Of Jacquet Rallis's Theorem.* With an appendix by the authors and Eitan Sayag. Duke Math. J. 149, Num. 3, 509-567, (2009).

[AG10] A. Aizenbud, D. Gourevitch, *Some Regular Symmetric Pairs*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, Vol. 362, Num. 7, Pages 3757-3777, (2010).

[AGRS10] A. Aizenbud, D. Gourevitch, S. Rallis, G. Schiffmann: *Multiplicity One Theorems*, Annals of Mathematics, Vol. 172, Pages 1407-1434, Issue 2, (2010). See also arXiv:0709.4215v1 [math.RT].

[AS12] A. Aizenbud, E. Sayag: *Invariant distributions on non-distinguished nilpotent orbits with application to the Gelfand property of (GL(2n,R),Sp(2n,R))*, Journal of Lie Theory, Vol. 22, Num. 1, Pages 137-153, (2012). See also arXiv:0810.1853 [math.RT].

[vdB88] E. van den Ban, *The principal series for a reductive symmetric space I*, Ann. Sc. Ec. Norm. Sup., Vol. 21, Pages 359-412, (1988).

[BD08] P.Blanck, P.Delorme, *Vecteurs distributions H-invariants de représentations induites, pour un espace symétrique réductif p-adique G/H* [H-invariant distribution vectors of induced representations for a p-adic reductive symmetric space G/H]. Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), Vol. 58, Num. 1, Pages 213-261, (2008).

[Ber10] Berhuy, Grègory. *An introduction to Galois cohomology and its applications.* With a foreword by Jean-Pierre Tignol. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, Vol. 377, xii+315 pp. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2010).

[BJ05] A. Borel , L. Ji, *Compactifications of Symmetric and Locally Symmetric Spaces*, Birkhauser, (2005).

[Bo91] A. Borel, *Linear algebraic groups.* Second edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 126. Springer-Verlag, New York, xii+288 Pages, (1991).

[BT65] A. Borel, J. Tits, *Groupes redutifs*, Publ. Math. I.H.E.S. Vol. 27, Pages 55-152, (1965).
[BvD94] E. P. H. Bosman and G. Van Dijk, *A New Class of Gelfand Pairs,* Geometriae Dedicata, Vol. 50 , Pages 261-282, KluwerAcademic Publishers, (1994).
[vD86] G. van Dijk, *On a class of generalized Gelfand pairs*, Math. Z., Vol. 193, Pages 581-593, (1986).
[Fli91] Y.Z. Flicker: *On distinguished representations*, J. Reine Angew. Math. Vol. 418, Pages 139-172, (1991).
[HW93] A. G. Helminck, S. P. Wang, *On rationality properties of involutions of reductive groups.* Adv. Math. Vol. 99, Num. 1, Pages 26-97, (1993).
[Jac62] R. Jacobowitz, *Hermitian Forms Over Local Fields*, American Journal of Mathematics, Vol. 84, Num. 3,Pages 441-465, (1962).
[JR96] H. Jacquet, S. Rallis, *Uniqueness of linear periods*, Compositio Math. Vol. 102, Num. 1, Pages 65-123, (1996).
[Ser73] J.-P. Serre, *A course in arithmetic* , Springer Verlag,viii + 115 Pages, (1973).
[Ser97] J.-P. Serre, *Galois cohomology*, Springer Verlag, x + 210, (1997).
[SZ12] B. Sun, C.-B. Zhu: *Multiplicity one theorems: the archimedean case*, Annals of Mathematics, Vol. 175, Num. 1, Pages 23-44, (2012).
[Zha10] L. Zhang: *Gelfand Pairs* $(Sp_{4n}(F); Sp_{2n}(E))$, J. Number Theory, Vol. 130, Num. 11, Pages 2428-2441, (2010).

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Weizmann Institute of Science, POB 26, Rehovot 76100, Israel. Email: shachar.carmeli@gmail.com